

THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

NOVEMBER, 1843.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MR. WILLIAM ROBINSON,

A DEACON OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, KNARESBOROUGH,
YORKSHIRE.

It has been often and justly deplored, that memorials of deceased deacons of our churches are not more frequently prepared by their pastors, or supplied by their families.

The value of the gratuitous services, which at least *five thousand* brethren, holding that office in our churches, statedly perform, in visiting the sick, relieving the poor, aiding the pastor, and in pleading the cause of Christian beneficence with their brethren and friends, cannot be fully estimated, and never has been adequately acknowledged.

Individuals, it may be, have sometimes used the powers with which the suffrages of their brethren invested them, in the spirit of him "who loved to have the pre-eminence;" but these happily are rare exceptions, for it may be truly said of the body of our deacons, in the language of the apostle Paul, "If our brethren are inquired of, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ." Memorials of the active lives and disinterested labours of departed deacons, may be as instructive and useful as those of deceased pastors; and therefore, we are happy to present our readers with a record of one, who, for four and forty years, served the Lord Jesus, and his church, in that office, with exemplary humility, perseverance, and consistency.*

* As the credit and comfort of our churches greatly depend on the choice of suitable brethren for the deacon's office, we beg to remind our readers of the beautiful address of the Congregational Union, on "the Office, Duties, and Qualifications of Deacons; with Advice to the Churches on the choice of Brethren to sustain that Office;" which was inserted in this Magazine, August 1841, pp. 525—538; and which is reprinted as No. V. of the Tract Series, and sold at 9s. per hundred.

When a church is about to proceed to an election, nothing could be more appropriate to circulate amongst its members than this invaluable tract.

Mr. William Robinson was born at Knaresborough, in the county of York, in the year 1768. Up to his seventeenth year there is no evidence that he felt any impression of the necessity of renewal by the Holy Ghost; his time was spent between the duties of a country school, and a thoughtless indulgence in the sports and pastimes of rural life.

It was when he was ten years of age, that the late Rev. W. Howell was sent to Knaresborough, to occupy a pulpit which had been provided by Mrs. John Thornton, of Clapham. That excellent and benevolent lady having occasion to visit the neighbouring spa, at Harrogate, deeply regretted that the only means of grace she could attend, were administered in an old and exceedingly inconvenient thatched chapel, at Knaresborough, called the Presbyterian Chapel, and those but once in the month. She therefore resolved, in the spirit of her munificent husband, on the erection of a new and commodious chapel, and guaranteed to Mr. Howell what was deemed sufficient for his maintenance for a few years. Mr. Robinson, then a youth, occasionally from curiosity, and sometimes probably for sport, attended this place of worship. His companions on these occasions were at least as frivolous and irreverent as himself, and the whole party were often found a great annoyance to the excellent minister before whom they sat. Mr. Howell at length resolved on speaking to young Robinson, on the impropriety of his behaviour. The excuse he stated was, that his companions tempted and encouraged him. Mr. Howell told him that if he really felt regret at being tempted to these improprieties in the house of God, he had better separate himself from his companions, and sit in the minister's pew, which was at his service. The advice was accompanied with some impressive remarks on the sinfulness of such unbecoming behaviour in the sanctuary, and "led me (the subject of our brief memoir used to say,) to the possession of a better Friend, which, I trust, I have never lost to this day."

His attendance at chapel now became regular, at least once on the sabbath, for in the morning he still joined in the services of the parish church. Now and then he was seen at the devotional week-day services in the chapel. His friends observing some change in his character, in connexion with his attendance on Mr. Howell's ministry, became alarmed, and various efforts were now tried to save him from the gulf of methodism, into which there was some reason to fear he would deliberately plunge. First, he was remonstrated with,—then he was threatened,—others were also employed to convey to him the solemn determination which had been formed, that if he persisted in keeping company with his new friends, he must expect to suffer all the consequences which his self-will and obstinacy would entail. At that time, he was about nineteen or twenty years of age. Amidst these difficulties he consulted a poor but excellent old woman, poor as

it respects this world, but rich in faith. Her counsel was summed up in these words, "*Niver* mind, bairn, the Lord will *tak* care of his *awen*;" but "if *ony* man be ashamed of me, and of my kingdom, of him will I be ashamed when I come in the glory of my Father." He stood firmly to his principles,—lost the respect of his friends; but he found the providence and grace of God to be all-sufficient. He often told his children that he was much indebted for whatever of consistency had marked his subsequent course, to the severity of his training in early life.

When about twenty-one years of age he joined the Congregational church at Knaresborough, then under the pastoral care of the Rev. W. Howell. He often said, that he took that step more for the sake of experimental religion, than for the principles of dissent. He had not looked at the question of national establishments. The arguments drawn from the sacred Scriptures and church history, in proof of the independence of the church of state control and state provision,—that it needed no other provision for its safety and extension than the grace and favour of its Divine Founder,—that the affairs of his kingdom were to be administered by his own servants, and according to his laws, and for which duties those only were fitted who had been sanctified by his grace; and that the church was a kingdom of which peace, righteousness, and joy in the Holy Ghost, were the prominent characteristics. He sought under a dissenting ministry the instruction he could not find in the parish church. But though influenced by this single motive, in the outset of his course, his nonconformity at last assumed the form of an avowed and self-denying attachment to the great New Testament principles of the constitution, order, and government of the church of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Soon after his union with the church he married. The object of his confidence and affection was, in some respects, more attached than himself to the forms of the Church of England, and stipulated to be allowed to attend the services of the parish church, at least once in the day. Ultimately, however, this was given up, and they both at last sat at one table to commemorate the love of the gracious Redeemer. In her he found a wise, frugal, and affectionate wife,—his children a mother possessing in an eminent measure all the dear attributes of that relation,—the poor and afflicted, a friend and helper never weary of ministering to their necessities and comforts,—and ministers and pious strangers, one whose hospitalities knew no bounds but her means and her strength. As she had opportunity, she was kind to all.

It was about the year 1798 that he began to discharge the duties of a deacon in the church. From that time, till within a short period of his death, he was never known to be absent from a prayer-meeting, or any public service held in the chapel, except when absent from home. At six o'clock on the morning of the Lord's-day, for many years,

he was always found in his place as leader of the prayer-meeting. For a few years, when the door-keeper, by age and infirmity, was incapable of fulfilling all his duties, Mr. R. was in the regular habit of going to chapel with his great-coat pocket filled with chips, and with a lantern in his hand, to light a fire for the convenience of those who attended that service in the winter. His contributions in support of the cause were always liberal; and during the last few years of his life, amounted nearly to one-fourth part of a very limited income.

In the year 1806, he was elected one of the constables of the borough, and from a conscientious view of the oath he had taken, resolved to put the laws in force, so far as he could, against all gaming, tippling, and other notorious vices on the Lord's-day. His determination subjected him to the censure and contempt of many, as savouring too much of the precision of the puritan—as being righteous overmuch—and his first acts exposed him to the bitter enmity of some most dissolute characters that then infested the town. Both parties endeavoured to dissuade him from his course by remonstrances and threatenings, but he was inflexible. On more than one occasion, he was threatened with personal violence. The beneficial effects, however, of his firmness, fortitude, and fidelity, were too manifest before the close of his year of service, to be unnoticed by those in the town who had some respect for its order and morals, and he was earnestly requested to take the office for a second year. In obedience to the wishes of his fellow-townsmen, he consented. As an expression of their concurrence with him, in his efforts to purge out the dissolute practices which had long been winked at, a number of gentlemen formed themselves into a committee, to assist him in this somewhat hazardous enterprise. Their united efforts were successful to a great extent, and Knaresborough became as much distinguished by its orderly observance of the Lord's-day, as it had been by the profane sports, which for many years had been tolerated to the scandal of the place.

When the commentary of the Rev. Thomas Scott was published, Mr. Robinson was among the most active in promoting its circulation. Among his papers was found a letter from that excellent divine, acknowledging his kind services. To himself it was a sufficient reward that he had rendered any assistance, by which that valuable work found its way into many private families, where he knew it was rendered the means of communicating sound and scriptural views of the Gospel of Christ.

In the year 1812 or 1813, he took a leading part in the formation of an association among the linen manufacturers of the town, principally for commercial purposes. But the very first meeting altered the character of all that followed. From questions of trade, the conversation had turned to those of religion; and till the meetings were discon-

tinued, they bore a strictly religious character. They were rendered very useful in the establishment of the minds of some of the members in the leading doctrines of the Gospel.

In the year 1815, he had the satisfaction of witnessing the reception of his second son John into the church at Knaresborough, at the age of sixteen. It must have afforded him great gratification, to see the first fruits of his prayers, holy example, and scriptural instructions, thus separated unto Christ. Others of his children afterwards followed in the same course. This was but the first step of his son; a second was soon after taken, by which he was devoted to the service of Christ and the church, by being given up to the work of the ministry. After having spent a few months under the care of that wise, excellent, and zealous minister of our Lord, the Rev. James Jackson, of Green-hammerton, he entered a student at Rotherham College, in the year 1816. A correspondence was then commenced by Mr. R., in which he sought to follow up all the efforts he had previously made, to lead all his children to understand the grace and the obligations of the Gospel of God our Saviour. We cannot forbear quoting a paragraph from one or two of his letters, written to his son just after he had been finally received by the Committee of the College to the full participation of all its benefits. "I am thankful that you have been considered worthy of the privileges of the College. I trust that you will not only be enabled to walk worthy of your station, but that the Lord will enable you to walk worthy of Him unto all pleasing. Pray earnestly that He will make you a scribe well instructed in the mysteries of the kingdom, and that He will be pleased to pour upon you the grace and spirit of the ministry. Without these, it is no more than any secular employment, and renders a man one of the most awful of all characters, for he can be esteemed by neither good nor bad men. If I were going to give you my last counsel, I would say, covet earnestly the best gifts—pray that the Lord would strip and empty you of self and self-aggrandisement—that he would give you all that may tend to your own humbling, and to His being exalted—that being made poor, you may be the means of making many rich through participating in His gracious fulness. I observe that you have had some fears about your examination. If anxious thoughts lead us to prayer, then they will do us good; but if not, they bring bondage and darkness. Probably some of your fears cannot be commended on any account. Fear is sometimes the offspring of pride. We are afraid lest our ignorance and poverty should be exposed, and that we should be considered by men of less importance than we have imagined ourselves to be, and they have done us the credit of thinking us to be. Such pride the Lord will be sure to rebuke in his people. The upright and humble the Lord delights to honour."

To another letter, on the subject of entering into the missionary field, he replied, "The contents of your letter have much affected me, and

brought into exercise a formidable train of parental feelings. These I could not overcome without I felt assured that the Lord had issued his mandate. I know that when the call to duty is clear, however painful or difficult the duty may be, there is no alternative for the upright servant but to bow submissive at his Master's feet, and say, 'Thy will be done,'—that the way to obtain that submissive spirit is not to reason with flesh and blood. I can truly say, it was well that it was in your heart to build the temple of the Lord. I have mentioned the subject to some of the brethren, and they are of opinion that such desires are often interwoven with the feelings and zeal of young Christians—that it is necessary that ministers should be deeply affected by the condition of the world at large, but that it does not therefore follow, that the desire of being employed in foreign labour is always an indication of the Lord's will. Time must be taken for prayer and consideration. My dear lad, believe me, I give you full credit for your enterprising spirit, and that no consideration should be offered by me, that should interfere betwixt God and you; but you must remember that it is written, He that believeth shall not make haste."

Mr. John Robinson having finished his course at Rotherham, became a pastor; first of the Congregational church at Middlewich, in Cheshire; then of the church at Manningtree, Essex, from whence he was called in the year 1830, to the oversight of the church in Chapel-street, Soho, London.

At the close of the year 1822, the respectful opinion of Mr. Robinson's fellow-townsmen placed him in the chair at the meetings which were held to discuss and prepare materials for a bill to be obtained from parliament, for lighting and paving, and otherwise improving the town. He was also appointed one of the first commissioners to carry out the provisions of that bill when it had obtained the royal assent; and for some time he took an active part in the discharge of the duties of that office.

In the year 1836, he was struck with apoplexy, by which he was so enfeebled in mind and body, as quite to disqualify him for taking any further share in the management of public business, though he recovered so far as to be able to go about and attend to the winding up of his own affairs. When restored a little after this heavy blow, he remarked to one of his children, "The Lord has sent me to many schools, to learn one lesson or another; but he has now sent me to one more, to learn something which I have neglected at them all." He now gave himself up wholly "to reading, meditation, and prayer." The Bible was his constant companion. Next to the sacred Scriptures, Flavel's works were diligently read.

His thoughts and feelings during these the closing years of his life, may be best gathered from his correspondence. In a letter written as soon after the stroke as he was able to write, he says, "I should be

glad if I felt more clear enjoyment of an interest in the truths I have professed to believe. This I find to be a more difficult attainment than I supposed. My depraved and fallen nature, and my heart corrupt and deceitful, seem to exclude the light from my mind. I know there is an Intercessor above, who knows my infirmities, and makes intercession for transgressors like me, pleading the merit of his blood : Him the Father always hears. This must be my refuge after all. Seeing that the Father will cast out none that come to him through Christ, I will pray that I may be able confidently to lay hold on eternal life through Him who is 'the way, the truth, and the life.'" In another letter, written but a few months before his death, he says, "'Shame and confusion of face belong to us.' This I can say of myself, that if I am but among those that fear the Lord, yet walk in darkness, it is my privilege notwithstanding to stay myself on God. For such a state I am constantly praying, believing that it is to be communicated only by the Spirit of the Lord."

Throughout his affliction, he repeatedly and deeply lamented his dulness ; still he displayed a resignation under some heavy calamities, which overtook him at the evening of his days, that gave clear proof that his faith was stronger than he supposed. When referring to these trials in one of his letters, he says, "I am thankful that I do not feel my mind severely exercised ; for I have been all my life long accustomed to such trials and losses. I know it is the easiest and safest way not to be anxiously careful about such things, but to submit to the appointments of Divine wisdom. I have enough left to meet my few wants, during the remainder of my pilgrimage, and then I shall have no more care and sorrow about such affairs."

In 1841, some symptoms appeared, which gave his friends too much reason to fear that disease had begun its work of destruction. Every mitigation was afforded that attention and skill could yield, but his once robust frame began to sink. Still, the apprehensions of his friends were not so serious, as the state of his health, if fully known, would have justified. But his views of the approaching change were, at times, bright and inspiring ; his conversation was in heaven ; his whole life had been a pilgrimage towards the Zion above, and, as he approached the end of his journey, the thought of a home, and of rest in God, was sweet to his soul. It was sweet, said a relative, to hear him converse with others as experienced as himself. It was a little heaven upon earth—the mount of God. Their faith, hope, peace, and anticipation of future glory, were beautiful ; not a cloud seemed to come over their heads. All, all was ascribed to the alone merits of the Redeemer. It was the doctrine and experience of the Bible.

On Monday, the 19th of December, 1842, it was manifest that his end was near. His mind was disquieted with thoughts of his infirmities, and fears of insincerity in the services which he had professedly ren-

dered to the cause of God. The 103rd Psalm was read to him by one of his children : he was comforted, and said, " These are sweet and precious promises." Another of his children arriving, having received a summons to take a last farewell, found him sufficiently sensible to recognise and to speak to her. He took hold of her hand, and said, " I hope, B. you feel the power of practical religion." She replied, " Yes, I trust I do." He then said, " Hold it fast, let it not slip." He added, " The Lord bless you, and lift up the light of his countenance upon you, and be your guide, even unto the end." He then again pressed her hand, and sunk into a sound sleep.

The following day, though deprived of sight, and scarcely able to speak, he was continually moving his hands, in the hope of catching hold of the hands of some of his children, and evidently felt comforted that they were near. But he was now on the verge of dissolution. The corporeal frame was too far disordered to connect the mind with the world in which he was still breathing. God alone was his help and portion, for heart and flesh were then failing. On Wednesday morning, December 21, he breathed his last without a struggle. The time of his departure had arrived, he took leave of the earthly house of this tabernacle, to be clothed upon with his house which is from heaven ; absent from the body, he became present with the Lord.

In his personal character, decision and firmness were leading traits. There was a large measure of conscientiousness at the root of these virtues. He had nothing of obstinacy. In business, in the management of his family, as a servant of the church, and in all the offices he filled in his native borough, he owed much of the respect he enjoyed, to these excellences. As a man of business, few ever obtained a larger share of the respect of those with whom they had transactions.

His attachment to the house of God was exemplary. His regularity and punctuality were proverbial. In his doctrinal opinions, he was a Calvinist ;—Boston, Ambrose, Flavel, and Scott were his favourite books. He was eminently a man of prayer.

He was not a party man, and yet his attachment to the principles and usages of Congregational churches, and his connexion with what may be termed the liberal party in politics, were so well known, that no one ever thought of asking him to do anything inconsistent with his connexion with either. In him consistency obtained its due reward. He was respected by most, if not by all ; and certainly those whose views and connexions placed them in the position of antagonists, honoured him with as much respect as those with whom he was more closely allied. But he was what he was by the grace of God. The truth as it is in Jesus early fastened upon his mind, and his whole life was kept under its power.

ON DR. PUSEY'S SERMON ON THE EUCHARIST,

IN LETTERS ADDRESSED TO A FRIEND.

LETTER I.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—I have read with some care, the sermon of Dr. Pusey, which you were kind enough to lend me; and, not wishing to keep it from you longer, I have procured a copy for myself, that I may give it another and still more attentive perusal; and, as I can probably express myself in writing more clearly than in conversation, I will, by letter, attempt to communicate to you what I think and feel.

I own to you that my mind has been much affected by the discourse; perhaps I should rather say, by some reflections to which it has given rise. It manifests much *seeming* reverence for the honour of God; it *appears* to have been prepared under devout influences, and to be the offspring of a deep and sincere piety; it contains several passages of great richness and power, and breathes some noble and divine aspirations, yet I cannot conceal my disappointment with it, both as a composition, and a statement of truth. The doctrinal sentiments which it is its chief aim to establish, I regard as utterly repugnant to the word of God, and to the genius and spirit of the Gospel; whilst its modes of thought, together with the style and manner in which it is written, appear to me as utterly unlike those of the New Testament Scriptures, as they are certainly foreign to all to which I have been accustomed. The differences between us are greater than can be accounted for, either by the different complexions of our mind, or by our different early associations. If Dr. Pusey is right, I am wrong. If I am right, he is wrong; and there is *serious error* somewhere. The first question that affected me accordingly was,—“Is it he, or is it I?” If I felt any hesitation in answering this question, I hope it was only such as a becoming humility and diffidence ought to induce. I am fully persuaded that I have not so read the Scriptures, as entirely to mistake their meaning, on the subject of the Lord's Supper; whilst I think I can detect some of the processes by which he has been led to the adoption of those views he has here advocated. The next inquiry that suggested itself, was both more painful and perplexing. Is this apparent piety, then, unreal and insincere? Does the decision I am compelled to arrive at, on the first question, involve the necessity of believing, that he who thus writes cannot be a man of God? Is it possible for the plant, not planted by the great Husbandman, to produce the very fruits of the tree of life; or *such* fruit as, whilst really of the vine of Sodom, cannot be distinguished from the grapes of Eshcol? Now, though these are deeply interesting questions, and questions from the consideration of which, the well-instructed scribe ought not to shrink, they are, in particular cases, attended with great difficulty;

whilst by our Lord himself we are admonished to "*judge no man.*" I prefer, therefore, now to waive this point; we may be better prepared hereafter, for those remarks which it may seem to require, and which it may be lawful to make; only laying down the general principle, *that there may be real piety*, where there is *some serious error*; the piety, however, in such cases, does not spring from the error, but exists in spite of it, and arises from the truth held in connexion with it.

Allow me to call your attention, in the first place, to the position in which Dr. Pusey and his party are pleased to place themselves; and to the inference they draw from it—I mean, that of men persecuted by the world for the defence of truth. They have been in the habit, for some time past, of giving great prominence to this imagined fact. It is gravely made the topic of the first paragraph of the Doctor's preface; where he tells us that, "increase of scoffers and blasphemers are among the tokens of the last days . . . the more the truth prevails, the madder must the world become; the blasphemies with which holy truth is now assailed, are but a token of its victories." And this opposition, it is evident, confirms him in his attachment to his peculiar views, and brings a pensive consolation to his mind.

Now it is quite true, that the world will always oppose and hate faithful doctrines; and that he who finds himself persecuted for righteousness' sake, is warranted in looking for the blessedness which God has annexed to the endurance of such persecution; but it cannot have escaped your observation, that every impostor and every fanatic, aims to believe, or to represent himself, as placed in this condition; and that those persons parade their sufferings most, whose views are most extravagant and absurd. But it so happens, that it is *NOT THE WORLD* that is up in arms against Dr. P. and his party. The world is comparatively silent; and if, by a portion of the ungodly and irreligious press, their doctrines are held up to contempt, it is in no other way, and for no other reason, than that which induces the same parties to assail what they call fanaticism of every kind. And if such opposition is any consolation to the Doctor and his followers, why then, the followers of Swedenborg, and Irving, and Mormon, are as much entitled to it as they. When Whitefield and Wesley, Newton and Romaine, Venn and Hill, began to exhibit those vital truths, which the clergy had hidden for a century; the world—whether in the church or out of it, clergy or laity, nominal Christians or infidels,—was aroused indeed; and showed its hostility in a way not to be mistaken. But it is *not the world now*; it is a large part of *the church itself* that pronounces Dr. P. a heretic. It is that portion of the Episcopalian church represented by the Christian Observer, the Churchman's Review, the Record, and, I was going to say, the Quarterly also; it is the whole of the Presbyterian churches, English, Scotch, and Irish; churches scarcely exceeded by any, in intelligence and piety. It is the whole of the churches of Protestant dissenters, whose creed is in almost perfect agreement with

the thirty-nine articles of these English tractarians ;—it is the increasing and powerful body of Wesleyan Methodists. We say then, that these men have *no right* to represent themselves as persecuted ; much less as persecuted by the world. They are believed by numbers of their own body, to be guilty of reviving ancient heresies, and heresies too, pronounced by their own formularies to be “damnable ;” and they are dealt with, as any society would deal with its members, in like circumstances ; yet they are not content with raising the cry of persecution—that stale trick of fanatics to excite sympathy and attract notice ; but, whilst putting on their “sackcloth,” they are guilty of the further artifice, as unworthy as it is absurd, of referring their “afflictions” to the madness of the world.

I will now direct your attention to some passages in the sermon, intended to expound the doctrine of the Eucharist ; that we may ascertain, if possible, the real sentiments of the party. In the preface, p. 4, after telling us that his own views were cast in the mould of the minds of Bishop Andrews, and Archbishop Bramhall, which he regarded as the type of the teaching of the church ; Dr. P. says, “From them originally,” (not, you will observe, from Christ, or from the apostles, or from the Scriptures,) “I learnt to receive in their literal sense, our blessed Lord’s solemn words,—‘This is my body ;’ and from them, while I believe the consecrated elements to become, by virtue of his consecrating words, truly and really, yet spiritually and in an ineffable way, His body and blood, I learnt also to withhold my thoughts as to the mode of this great mystery ; but as a mystery ‘to adore it.’ . . . With (them) then, I could not but speak of the consecrated elements as being what, since he has so called them, I believe them to become, His body and blood,” &c. Again, Sermon, p. 18, “To him (the saint) its special joy is, that it is his Redeemer’s very broken body, it is his blood which was shed for the remission of his sins. In the words of our ancient church, he ‘drinks his ransom,’ he eateth that, ‘the very body and blood of the Lord.’” Again, p. 20, “His flesh and blood in the sacrament shall give life, not only because they are the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Word, who is life, but also because they are the very flesh and blood which were given and shed for the life of the world, and are given *to those for whom* they had been given.” This last position, you will observe, is deduced from the language of our Lord in his discourse, recorded in the sixth chapter of John’s Gospel ; which discourse, Dr. Pusey throughout his sermon takes as the key to the interpretation of the mystery of the Sacrament ; and of which, more hereafter.

I will now refer to one or two passages, in which the Doctor states his views of the use of the Lord’s Supper, and the benefits it is intended to convey. “Baptism,” he says, Sermon, p. 2, “containeth not only remission of sins, actual or original, but maketh members of Christ, &c. The holy eucharist imparteth not life only, spiritual strength, and new-

ness with Christ, and his indwelling and participation of him; but, in its degree, remission of sins also." See also p. 4. "'Whoso eateth my flesh,'" we read p. 8, "'and drinketh my blood,' (He himself says the amazing words) 'eateth me,' and so receiveth into himself, in an ineffable manner, his Lord himself, 'dwelleth,' (our Lord says) 'in me, and I in him,' and having Christ within him, not only *shall* he have, but he *hath* already eternal life, because he hath Him who is the only true God, and eternal life; and so Christ will raise him up at the last day, because he hath his life in him. Receiving him into his very body, they who are his, receive life, which shall pass over to our very decaying flesh; they have within them, Him who is life, and immortality, and incorruption, to cast out or absorb into itself, our natural mortality, and death, and corruption, and shall live for ever, because made one with Him who alone liveth for evermore."

To set before you fully, however, Dr. Pusey's views, I am aware I ought to make several other quotations; but I really know not what passages to transcribe. I am exceedingly puzzled to ascertain his meaning; his style is so unenglish, his sentences so curiously constructed, his own language and that of others so intermingled, in "confusion worse confounded," and his thoughts so cut up, and scattered over a space of thirty pages, that I cannot get a luminous view of his doctrine. Phantoms indeed, he makes to pass before my imagination, like the gleams that sometimes break through a misty twilight; but I think I never experienced greater difficulty in getting at the meaning of the most involved or metaphysical writer I ever read, than I find in gaining a clear and distinct idea of his meaning. I ought to refer you for example to the paragraph, p. 4, "The chief object, then," &c., and desire you to read many passages, from p. 7 to 13. But I confess that, to me, they are wholly unintelligible. I cannot think that the writer himself understands them; if, however, you can attach to them a meaning, and will be kind enough to convey it to me, I will promise you, as I do not wish to overlook any argument, fairly to notice it.

Some one has said, that "he who *thinks* clearly, will *write* so as to be understood;" Dr. Pusey may reply, The whole subject is a mystery, and cannot be explained. I answer, I ask not for any explanation of *what is mysterious*; I only want him to put in intelligible language, *what it is that he believes* about it, and wants others to believe. This he *must* do, or he cannot expect them to say *credo*. This he attempts to do, but utterly fails; and involves the whole subject in that nebulous obscurity, in which minds more imaginative than sound and sober, delight; and which reminds one of the mystery that hung over the responses of the Pythian goddess, and attended the esoteric doctrines of the Grecian sages.

I shall, nevertheless, attempt to state, in few words, what I suppose

to be the teachings of the sermon before me. Dr. P. then receives in their literal sense, the words, "This is my body," and "this is my blood;" he does not advocate, however, "the *corporal* presence of Christ's *natural* flesh and blood;" but affirms their presence really and truly, though spiritually and in an ineffable way; and supposes the bread and wine, when the consecrating words of the priest are pronounced, to become actually the body and blood of Christ. The meaning of this, if it has any meaning, I apprehend *must be*, that it is not the *gross material* of Christ's body, that corporal nature, which he had when on earth; but the body he *now* wears, his spiritual and glorified body, that "commingles with the elements, and converts them into his own substance." Now he does not say this, in so many words; but unless he is prepared at once to affirm, that that very body, which on earth was nourished by meats and drinks, and in every respect like our own, is "verily and indeed taken and received of the faithful;" he is driven to the alternative of maintaining, that it is the *spiritual and glorified body* he now wears in heaven. This body then, when we take the consecrated bread and wine, we really eat and drink, it imparts to us life, so that we become "mingled with his flesh, mingled with him, that we might become in a manner one substance with him, the one body and flesh of Christ." It "passes over to our very decaying flesh; they have within them, Him who is life, and immortality, and incorruption, to cast out or absorb into itself our natural mortality, and death, and corruption." So writes Dr. Pusey, with much more to the same purpose. I confess I wish he had not been "hindered by sudden indisposition from developing his meaning as he wished;" for certainly it is not here developed so as to enable my feeble eye to catch it. Nevertheless there are a few questions we should like to ask, and to which we should like an answer.

Dr. Pusey, then, says he receives the words "This is my body," &c. in their literal sense; and yet he does not advocate the corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood; and affirms its presence only in a spiritual and ineffable way. We want to know *how this can be taking the words literally?* Literally means, according to the letter; and the words "This is my body," *literally* taken mean, that the bread he broke was the *very body*, the disciples saw and touched,—the very flesh, blood, bones, &c., &c., of which it was composed; and we ask, whether, when he goes on to say, that it is in a *spiritual* way, only that that flesh, and blood, and bones, &c. were present, it is not sheer nonsense, such as any man who knows the power of words, ought to be ashamed to pen?

We inquire again, what Dr. Pusey means, or what the Article he quotes means, by saying, that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." We confess that this statement has always puzzled us, and its real import

is the first matter to be settled. It is susceptible of two interpretations. 1st. The body of Christ is a figure for Christ himself, and what he did for our salvation, in his body; of which we are reminded by the bread which is broken at the Lord's table, which is to be spiritually regarded, and received by faith. But this will not do for Dr. Pusey, since the holy eucharist would then lose all its mystery, which to him is its charm. 2ndly. The only remaining interpretation is the one we have ourselves been obliged to invent, or at least to bring out, to give anything like tangibility to the statements of the Sermon, viz. that it was not the *visible* body of Christ, but what should, after the resurrection, be his *spiritual* and glorified body. If he says, that neither he nor the article means this, we then ask what he does mean? and insist upon an answer; for we must know *what* we are to believe, before we can believe it. If, however, he is willing to accept our explanation, we then say again, *this* is not to understand our Lord's words literally; and further ask where he learnt to interpret those words, not of the body the disciples saw, but of that he should hereafter wear?

What then is it, according to Dr. Pusey, that we do in eating bread at the Lord's table? 1st. Do we, literally, eat the very body of Christ? I hope we should both reply, No. 2nd. Do we, physically, eat Christ's spiritual body? I trust we should be further agreed, that this is both absurd and impossible. 3rd. Do we spiritually eat Christ's spiritual body? I confess I can attach no idea to the proposition. To eat is, properly, to receive food into the body, by dentrication,—metaphorically, to receive truth into the mind; and spiritual eating is thus to receive spiritual truth. The disciples ate bread, they did this literally; they also believed the great truth that the body of Christ, represented by that bread, was broken for them; in other words, that Christ, in the flesh, died, that they might have life; and in believing it they received that life; and thus they ate, spiritually, Christ and the doctrine of Christ. Of any third kind of eating we never heard before; and as for spiritually eating the spiritual body of Christ, we want to know what idea we are to attach to it, and where it is to be found in the New Testament? 4th. Do we not rather in the Lord's supper merely eat broken bread as an emblem of the sufferings and death of the adorable Redeemer; which sufferings and death, when appropriately regarded, *i. e.* believed, relied upon, bring to the child of God life, and peace, and joy unspeakable and full of glory? Is not this the natural explanation of the scriptural account of the institution? Is it not a sufficient explanation? Is there anything beyond it, so much as hinted at? and if so, what is it?

Again, Dr. Pusey says he interprets literally the sentence "This is my body," etc. Be it so; then, my dear friend, I inquire if he is not bound to interpret literally every one of those forms of expression, which the evangelists assure us he used, or which the apostle Paul says he employed? Now, all the sacred writers represent him as saying

of the bread, "This is my body;" but there is a singular difference respecting the wine: Matthew and Mark inform us that "he took the *cup*" . . . "saying, For this is my blood of the new testament or covenant." His words, as recorded by Luke, are, "This *cup* is the new covenant in my blood;" which is the form also given by the apostle Paul. Here, not the *wine*, but the *cup* is his blood; and in the one case, the cup is his *blood*; while in the other, it is the *new covenant* in his blood (*ἐν τῇ ἐμῷ αἵματι*). When he says of the bread, "this is my body," is it not an expression of a similar kind? Can *any* reason be given for adopting different modes of interpretation? Could any one who reads the one or the other be at a loss as to its meaning, if he exercised his common sense, and had no purpose to serve? I trow not.

Jesus took bread and brake it, and said, "This is my body." Was this an unusual mode of speaking with him? Is it with any of the sacred writers? Let us see. "I am the door;" "I am the good shepherd;" "I am the way;" "I am the vine;" "I am the resurrection and the life;" etc. He is "the Day-star, the Rose of Sharon, the Lion of the tribe of Judah." "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks are the seven churches." "It" *i. e. the roasted flesh of the lamb, the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs*, "it is the Lord's passover." Are not these figurative modes of speech? Are they not all figures of the same kind? Can you point out to me any rule, or assign to me any reason to justify your making any difference between them? Would not the school-boy be laughed at as a dunce, who imagined that a speaker meant to say, literally, that *bread* was *his body*; or that he, the speaker, was a door? Is it not puerile in learned divines thus to interpret language which nobody else could possibly misunderstand? Nor let me in thus writing be misunderstood by you. I wish to interpret the Scriptures aright. I can conscientiously say, that if I could see ground to believe that the Lord Jesus intended to be understood as Dr. Pusey understands him, I would *at once and reverently* bow; but I have hitherto met with no argument that has, in my judgment, any weight in that direction. The view I take, on the contrary, appears to me to be in accordance with the genius of the Gospel, whilst I feel little difficulty in tracing to its causes the erroneous one which I oppose.

There is one argument against it, which I think of some force, but which I have not seen noticed; I will state it here in few words. It appears to me, that if Dr. Pusey's interpretation be allowed, the immediate and chief, if not the sole advantages resulting to a believer from the Lord's supper, are advantages TO THE BODY; I say not exclusively, yet to the body rather than to the soul. Whether he has himself distinctly conceived this idea, I pretend not to say; I can make nothing else, however, of some of his statements, and my conjecture is that *it* is his doctrine; but, acting on the principle of reserve, he wraps it

for the present in some obscurity. At pp. 8, 9, he says that by receiving HIM into this very body, life is received which passes over to *our very decaying flesh*, etc. In a note, in the same page, we read that "our bodies receiving the eucharist are no longer corruptible." Again, pp. 16, 17, we are "*mingled with that flesh*;"—his body or nature, "by commingling our body or nature with itself, all but removes it from the conditions of created nature, and re-forms it according to itself." See also note pp. 17—21. I suppose all this means, (for such is the involved construction, such the obscure and mystic style of the doctor, that we cannot be sure,) I suppose that all this means, that the flesh and blood of the Son of man, which we eat in the Lord's supper, by some mysterious process, acts on our flesh and blood; and in the case of those who believe, even now, is gradually but secretly turning *this* our *natural body*, into a spiritual body; and is preparing it not less than the soul for another state. The first question that occurs is, where do the *Scriptures* teach any such doctrine? To me, I confess it is new; and though I have been in the habit of pondering on our Lord's institution for many years, this is an idea that the language of inspiration never suggested to my mind. Yet if it is the very flesh and blood of Christ that we eat, in that ordinance, this *must be* the true doctrine; for matter cannot feed mind,—flesh cannot nourish spirit, and the design of the institution relates principally to the body. Now I had always thought, that the Lord's supper was designed, as Christ himself appears to say, to excite our grateful remembrance of his dying love, and thus *principally* to refresh and establish our souls in grace. But Dr. Pusey says, p. 18, were it *only* this, "it would have no direct healing for the sinner. To him, its special joy is, that it is his Redeemer's *very broken body*," etc. I object to his views then, because it makes the *only* rite of the Christian church, have respect to the *body*, rather than the soul. Again, the New Testament tells me, it is true, that every child of God keeps his body under; that he dies daily; and that, if faithful, his affections are gradually mortified and subdued; but I had been accustomed to suppose, that this subjection of the body was the result of the sanctification of the mind, by the power of the Spirit, through the truth; *e. g.*: Here is a man irascible, implacable, given to revenge; he becomes meek, gentle, and forgiving. I should have supposed, that this resulted from the contemplation of the character and example of Christ,—that, constrained by his love and taught by his Spirit, he suppresses those evil passions, and matures these graces; so that, by degrees, the former become feeble and die, and in the body as well as the spirit he glorifies God. And this is sufficient; the effect wants no other cause; and I apprehend that where we have an adequate cause, it is contrary to Divine as well as human philosophy to search for a second. But not so Dr. Pusey. According to him, this purification of our body results from the commingling of

Christ's very flesh and blood with ours in the holy eucharist. I shall not be so rude as to deny that this is the case ; but I take leave to say, that I require clear *scriptural* evidence of it, before I receive it.

But what is the testimony of fact ? If this doctrine of the actual communication of Christ's body to our body be true, it must produce corresponding effects on those who receive it. What are they ? Take two men, one of the doctor's school, the other of the opposite ; nay, let the other be a deist if you will, only let them be of similar constitution and similar temperate habits : and I ask, will you be able to discern any difference as to their bodies, in life or in death ? Or does he say, the effects are secret, invisible,—and though real, not to be inquired into by curious mortals ? Again I say, it may be so : show me *the evidence however*, then I will reverently believe.

I think such a doctrine not only unsupported by Scripture, but *contrary* to it. I cannot find any inspired writer speaking of any effect produced on our bodies here, except through the mind. The thoughts, volitions, and affections of the mind, are sanctified by the Spirit of truth, and as a consequence, will keep *the body* in subjection. The apostle Paul expected no such change on our bodies here, as that which the Dr. mystically describes. It is when the Lord Jesus shall come from heaven, that *he* looked for his vile body to be changed ; whilst in another place he affirms, that it is *sown in corruption*, in dishonour, in weakness ; it is *sown a natural body* : and it is not till the last trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised, that it will appear in incorruption, and glory, and power, and become a spiritual body. This I think decisive of the question ; and these passages appear to me at once opposed to his doctrine, and irreconcilable with it.

But I must conclude. I intended to have noticed in this letter, Dr. Pusey's principal argument drawn from Scripture ; which I think can be shown to be utterly untenable. I will however, as soon as I can, take it up, and conclude what I have to say in a second epistle. In the mean time, allow me to subscribe myself,

Yours, very sincerely.

5th Sept. 1843.

THE DECALOGUE ;

ITS SUBSTANTIAL IDENTITY WITH THE MORAL LAW, AND
PERMANENT OBLIGATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

DEAR SIR,—The present subject is not one that can be considered trivial, or only of minor importance. It is of considerable moment ; not so much from its bearing on the question of the Divine authority of the Lord's-day, as from its bearing on the correct understanding of a considerable portion of the word of God.

In the last paper of W. S.* there are many incorrect statements which need not be noticed, as some of them have been already met, and some do not bear on the main question. The points which I undertake to prove, in opposition to W. S. are three: that all the precepts of the decalogue are essentially moral precepts,—that the decalogue contains the substance of the whole moral law,—and that it *is*, and is recognised in Scripture, as of permanent obligation. These points embrace the whole of the subject which has been brought under discussion by W. S. I maintain, then,

I. That all the precepts of the decalogue are moral (as opposed to positive) precepts.

"The moral law" is defined by W. S. to be "that rule of conduct which rational beings are bound to observe, by a regard to the relations in which they are placed." Taking this definition as correct, and it is sufficiently so for our present purpose, it will follow, that a moral precept is a precept naturally binding on an intelligent creature, in virtue of the relations he sustains to God and the universe. Moral precepts, then, are distinguished from those which are *positive*, by the circumstance that the latter are obligatory, simply in consequence of a special command, and are founded on no natural relationship: baptism and the Lord's supper are examples of this kind.

Taking this view of the moral law and of moral precepts, I feel perfectly satisfied that the question, respecting the moral or positive character of the decalogue precepts, is settled for ever. I might take each precept, and ask respecting it, Is this moral, or is it positive? with the assurance that ninety-nine out of every hundred intelligent men would reply at once, It is moral. But I need not do this; W. S. admits that all these precepts, with the exception of the fourth, are moral. None can deny that it is morally and eternally binding on us to have no other God than Jehovah, to hallow his name, to honour our parents, to avoid injuring the life or health of our neighbour, and every thing that would lead to it, to shun all impurity, to respect the rights and property of our fellow-men, to avoid bearing false witness, and to beware of covetousness. But I venture to maintain that the fourth commandment is as truly moral as any of the rest; and that any code professing or set forth to be the moral law, and which would omit the *substance* of this commandment, would be *essentially defective*: this, I think, I proved before, though W. S. has taken no notice of the proofs adduced. Who will deny that social or public worship is a duty involved in the moral law? or that it is equally and in like manner, the duty of man to set apart a portion of his time for such

* Congregational Magazine for May, 1843.

worship? The *particular* day, whether first or seventh, or any other, may vary: it does not enter into the essence of the precept; it is positive. But we must not confound, as W. S. does, the particular day, with the *principle* of the law; or, as it is said in a former article, we must distinguish between the precept, and the language in which it is clothed. The consecration of a stated portion of our time to the public worship of Jehovah, is as obligatory upon us as any other duty. It arises out of our relation to ourselves, (if I may use the expression,) our relation to our fellow-men, and our relation to God, our Creator and Governor. It is absolutely necessary to the perpetuation of true religion in the world. All that we need to know is, *what* day we are to observe. The slightest indication of this is sufficient. The seventh day was pointed out to the Jews. The first day is indicated to us, while we are plainly told that the Jewish sabbaths are abolished. If W. S. would cease to confound things that differ, if he would strive to distinguish between the *essence* of a law and its *form*, he would have no occasion to quote so often as he does the passage from Colossians, relating to "sabbath-days." Jewish sabbaths need no longer to be observed, while the principle of the sabbatic law may remain in full force. The observance of the "Lord's day" rests on that principle as its basis; but it is supported by other, and I think, sufficient evidence, —which evidence has been already adduced.

If then, the observance of a stated portion of time, as sacred to Jehovah, is thus called for by our moral, and, in one sense, natural relationships, and by the claims of religion itself, nothing can be plainer, than that the moral law of W. S. being without such a day, would be radically and essentially defective. Instead, then, of the decalogue being "redundant by admitting the fourth commandment," it would, as a moral law, have failed of completeness,—been miserably deficient, without such a precept. But I pass on to my second position:

II. *That the decalogue contains the substance of the whole moral law.* I say the *substance*; for it has never been regarded as a full exposition or developement of that law. I know of no duty which it does not *express* or *imply*. Of course, in considering it, we must (guided by correct laws of exposition,) have regard to the *principle* rather than the *letter* of each precept. We must view each in its own essential character, divested of mere accidental appendages. We are not to be guided by rabbinical notions, or rabbinical interpretations. We must expound the decalogue as we would any other portion of the sacred volume, bringing to bear upon it the usual legitimate canons of biblical interpretation. Let us then endeavour to ascertain how far W. S. is correct, in regarding the decalogue as "deficient," as merely with "one exception," "prohibiting crimes without inculcating the

opposite virtues;" and as being such that a "person might strictly fulfil all its demands, without possessing moral excellence!" I need not hesitate to say, that I regard W. S. as altogether and seriously astray in hazarding these assertions. As to the statement, that the decalogue prohibits crimes without inculcating the opposite virtues, surely it was uttered without consideration. When God forbids a sin, does he not virtually inculcate the opposite virtue? When the worship of idols is forbidden, is not the worship of himself virtually enjoined? When John says, "Love not the world," are we to stick to the *letter* of the precept, and to consider it as enjoining a mere negative virtue? Can a prohibitory precept, given by God, be obeyed without the opposite virtue being cultivated? When God says, "Thou shalt have no other gods except me," can a rational creature obey this without having Jehovah for his God? Impossible! Man *must* have a God,—even if that God be himself.

As to the assertion that "a person might strictly fulfil the demands" of the decalogue "without possessing moral excellence," it really looks so monstrous (let W. S. pardon me,) that I could scarcely have conceived that any man of intelligence could hazard it. It is utterly unfounded. The very first of the decalogue precepts cannot be obeyed by any one without his possessing high "moral excellence." "Thou shalt have no other God beside me" implies, first, that we are to have Jehovah for our God; and secondly, that no other object is to be associated with him in our regards. There is then ONE God, and he alone is to be ours. How can this precept be obeyed without yielding to him our *whole* heart? How can it be obeyed without loving him supremely? In what other way can God be our God? Thus we perceive that this decalogue, so undervalued by W. S., sets out with placing before us the one living and true God, the recognition of whose existence and unity is the *basis* of all religion, and inculcating on us the possession of him as our God, which is the foundation and substance of all personal piety,—all moral excellence. The "mere command to abstain from polytheism," if it must be so designated, implies and inculcates right views of God, and right affections towards him. Such is the first commandment.

The *second* forbids the worshipping of him through any material mediums or emblems. Forbidding the wrong mode of worshipping him, it necessarily, by implication, inculcates the right. Prohibiting the worshipping of him through images, it necessarily enjoins, if he is to be worshipped at all, the worship of him with the *intellect* and the *heart*.

The *third* precept of the law forbids profanity and irreverence in respect to the Divine Name, and inculcates profound reverence for God. "Thou shalt not lift up, or pronounce, the name of the Lord thy God,

(אֵלֶיךָ) in vain."* The language of Isaiah is a commentary on this: "Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." Can such holy fear, such reverence for the Deity, exist in the heart where the fire of pure devotion does not burn with A STEADY FLAME? Can it?

The *fourth* commandment makes provision for a certain season to be devoted to the worship of God and the cultivation of piety in the heart. These four comprise the first table of the law: what duty owing to God is not comprehended in these?

Then, as to the second table, enjoining as it does, all respect and obedience due to parents, a regard to life, to personal purity, to the property and reputation of our neighbour, and the regulation of the very desires of the heart, what is there omitted? Acting on these precepts of the second table, men will invariably do unto others as they would others should do unto them. They will love their neighbour as they love themselves. They will not be found quarrelsome, or insubordinate, or envious, or unkind, or unchaste, or ruled by irregular desires; but will continue in the discharge of all social duties devolving on them, and thus will experience the blessedness of the "undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord."†

But W. S. says, "To the other deficiencies of the decalogue, considered as a moral code, must be added, its omission of all denunciations against vice, or those sins which chiefly affect the transgressor himself." And he denies that this objection lies against the "two great commandments,"—commandments which do not contain a word of denunciation at all, nor refer to man's duty to himself. And what is his reason for saying this? Why these two commands "involve the principle of holy love;" and when the Christian "receives an unction from the Holy One," he needs not that any should teach him these duties, (I suppose those due to himself,) "but spontaneously perceives and embraces them." But how this shows that the "two great commandments" embrace "denunciations against vice," is a mystery, and perhaps must remain so. If W. S. means that these "two great commands" embrace by implication all possible duties, I grant it. But this is true of the decalogue; obedience to its precepts is universal holiness, love is its

* Jer. ii. 30: vi. 29. This rendering is preferable to that adopted by Stuart and Gesenius, namely, "thou shalt not utter the name of Jehovah upon, or in respect to a falsehood." אֵלֶיךָ sometimes has the signification of *falsehood*; but I have found no instance where it occurs preceded by the preposition *בְּ* having *clearly* this sense. Psalm xxvi. 4, may be correctly rendered "who does not vainly lift up himself." אֵלַי must not unfrequently be rendered as a personal pronoun.

† Can a man obey this law "without possessing moral excellence?"—a law that brands malice and hatred as *murder*, and the lustful look as *adultery*?—Matthew v. 21, 22, 27, 28. This commentary on the sixth and seventh commandments is a *specimen* of the correct interpretation of the law.

very substance; "love is the fulfilling of the law." There can be no obedience without love; and love to God and man includes or implies all duties, even those which a man owes himself. Besides, it is impossible to comply with the individual and specific precepts of the second table, especially the sixth and seventh, while there exists anything like the sinful indulgence of the appetites, or the violation of temperance. There may be a compliance with the *letter*, but that is all; and that, God has never regarded as obedience. *Man* may look to the *letter*; but God looks to the *spirit*. "Man may look to the outward appearance, but God looketh to the heart."

W. S. dwells very much on the "two great commandments," which he "prefers" to the decalogue, and regards as comprehensively including all duties. But what if these two precepts are simply an *epitome* of the decalogue,—its sum and substance, expressed in a few words? Then, W. S. must acknowledge that the decalogue is not *defective*, and that it is a summary of the moral law. And yet, in my view, nothing is more obvious,—what can be clearer than the statements of James? "If ye fulfil the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well." He then adds, that if they have "respect to persons," they were "convicted by the law as transgressors," because this contravened the precept just quoted. But, by what law were they convicted? By the "royal law" just cited; and this is shown to be the same which says, Thou shalt not commit adultery." Take the whole passage together: "If ye fulfil the *royal law* according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect of persons, (which is opposed to the royal law,) ye commit sin, and are convicted by the [same] law as transgressors; for whosoever shall keep the whole law, [surely the same law,] and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all; for he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now, if thou commit no adultery, yet, if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law."—James ii. 8, 11. Nothing can be plainer than this.

The identity of the "two great commandments," with the decalogue is apparent also from the 13th of Romans, where Paul asserts that "love is the fulfilling of the law," and every precept of the second table is included in this one, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The same thing is clear from Gal. v. 14, where we are told the whole law is "*fulfilled*" in the precept enjoining love to our neighbour.

Then as to the *moral*—moral as opposed to *positive* character of the whole law, it is plain from this simple declaration: "the law (considered as a whole—*ὅλον*) "is holy, the commandment" (each specific precept) "is holy, and just, and good," (Rom. vii. 12.) That the decalogue is here intended is plain, for it is quoted as saying, "Thou shalt not covet." But if that law were partly ceremonial and positive,

Paul would use very different language respecting it; designating, as he frequently does, the ceremonial institutes of the old economy "weak and beggarly elements."

Further; in proof not only of the moral character of the decalogue precepts, but also of the completeness of the decalogue viewed as a whole, we adduce the fact that the fulfilment of the righteousness of this law is exhibited as the perfection of the Christian character: "What the law was unable to effect, because it was weak through the flesh, God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, effected, and on account of sin, condemned sin in the flesh; *that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled by us, who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit,*" (Rom. viii. 3, 4.) Here one great object of the death of Christ is represented to be the *sanctification* of believers, and this is expressed by the "righteousness of the law" being "fulfilled in or by them. Righteousness signifies precept, or requirement; compliance with this, even under the present dispensation, is the sanctification of the people of God. Nothing can show more completely that the law of the ten commandments is a *perfect rule of moral action*, neither "*redundant*," nor "*deficient*," but embracing in substance the whole compass of Christian requirement, and Christian duty.

But I proceed now to my third position;—it is this:

III. *That the decalogue is of permanent obligation.*

This position I regard as already proved. It is involved in the two preceding positions, and follows from them as a necessary inference. But I state it separately for the sake of noticing some statements of W. S., and adducing a few additional texts of Scripture.

W. S. asserted in a former article that the decalogue had a "beginning and an end." This assertion he reiterates; but *now* he explains it as referring to the law considered as the "basis of the Mosaic covenant." But this, no one ever denied; moral or ceremonial, it could be the basis of that covenant only, while the covenant itself lasted. But when he says that it is expressly stated in Scripture that it had a "beginning and an end," I am totally at issue with him. No such assertion is made in Scripture. In the third chapter of Galatians, the giving of the law as the basis of the Mosaic covenant, is spoken of as taking place 430 years after the Abrahamic covenant; but that is all; and who ever questioned this? or what is it to the point in hand? Its existence prior to the Mosaic covenant is nowhere denied. Every precept of it, as a matter of *fact*, was in existence from the beginning; not, I will admit, in the same *shape*, but it is the *substance* rather than the shape that must chiefly be regarded.

W. S. however, quotes some texts of Scripture in application to the decalogue which have no reference to it at all. "The *law* and the

prophets were until John." Here the *law* denotes all the Old Testament Scriptures, not comprehended in the "prophets;" still the declaration does not surely insinuate that they ceased to exist *after* John.

Again, he quotes the seventh of Hebrews, where the apostle treats of the *priesthood*, and the *law of the priesthood*, and argues, that a change in the former implies a change in the latter, and avers that there is a "setting aside of the preceding commandment" relating to priesthood: he quotes this passage and this reasoning in application to the decalogue; whereas there is not here the most distant reference to it. Priesthood, and the law of priesthood are treated of, and these alone. We should be very careful how we interpret the word of God; to "handle it deceitfully is a serious evil."

A similar misapplication is made of Eph. ii. 11—18, and Col. ii. 13—15; where the apostle treats of the abolition, *not* of the decalogue, but of the *ceremonial law*. That the latter is intended, is as clear as clear can be; it is represented as the "middle wall of partition" between Jews and Gentiles—the cause of the "enmity" between them; and the abolition of it by the cross of Jesus Christ is set forth as the means of effecting a reconciliation of both in "one body," the means of making them "one new man." Now we know the decalogue was not a middle wall of separation between them. There was nothing in its nature to keep them distinct. But the ceremonial law was very different in this respect; it did necessarily keep the Jews a distinct people from all others, and it was a cause of enmity between them; many parts of it seem to have answered no other end than to keep the Jews a distinct people, and prevent them amalgamating with the surrounding nations, and this that they might retain the truth in its simplicity and purity; but when "the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, appeared unto all men," when all nations were invited to participate of the salvation of the Gospel, and Jews and Gentiles, henceforth on an equality, were to form one church, every thing purely national, and serving only to perpetuate national distinctions, was to be abolished. Hence the "middle wall of partition," consisting of ceremonial observances, gave way, to rise no more for ever; it was annihilated by the cross.

In the third chapter of second Corinthians, that which is represented as being *abolished* (*καταργούμενον*) is not the decalogue, but the Sinaic dispensation, which was purely legal, and which is opposed to the permanent (*τὸ μένον*) dispensation of grace introduced and established by Jesus Christ.

We rejoice in the glorious truth, that the legal covenant is no more—that in regard to the obtaining of eternal life believers are not under law but under grace,—and that the grand object of the mission of the Son of God was to "redeem them that are under the law" from its

bondage and curse, "that they might receive the adoption of sons." No truths are more precious than these; none ought to be presented to the view of men with greater clearness; but the strictest and most cordial adherence to these, does not, in the least, interfere with the position maintained, that the decalogue precepts are of permanent obligation.

I object to the rendering adopted by W. S. of 1 Tim. i. 5, &c., namely, "the law is excellent, provided a person employs it according to its nature, and perceives its proper application, which is not to a righteous man," &c. "*Application*" is not the idea conveyed by the verb employed, (*κεῖται*.) The correct idea is expressed by Middleton, and adopted by Bloomfield: "Recollecting that neither the Mosaic, nor *any other law* is directed *against* the just and good, but only against the lawless and disorderly;" against the righteous man, as against the fruits of righteousness, there is no law: however law may be for the directory of his conduct, and may apply to him as such, it is not against him, it cannot injure him.

I shall now adduce a few texts of Scripture in which the permanency of the decalogue law is either asserted or implied. The first I shall refer to is Matt. v. 17—19: "Suppose not that I am come to annul the law and the prophets; I am not come to annul, but to give effect to them. For truly I say to you, Until heaven and earth shall pass away, one iota, or one tittle, shall by no means pass away from the law, until all shall be accomplished. Whosoever, therefore, shall violate one, even of the least* of these commandments, and shall so teach men, shall be called least (shall be of no esteem) in the kingdom of heaven. But whosoever shall perform them and [so] teach, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." That the law here intended is the decalogue, there can, I think, be no question. The subsequent part of the discourse proves this. It is the precepts of this law, our Lord proceeds to explain and exhibit in their full spiritual import. This law he declares he did not come to annul, or put an end to; he came, on the contrary, to *give effect and stability to it*; for this is obviously the force of *πληρῶσαι* as opposed to *καταλῦσαι*. This beautifully corresponds with the language of Paul, "Do we then abrogate the law by faith? far be it; yea, we establish the law."—(Rom. iii. 31.)

But there is another strong point in our Lord's declaration, quite

* Or, "one of these least commandments,"—*μὴν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων*. This rendering appears the most literal, and if the correct one, the precepts of the decalogue may be called *least* in reference to the two "great" commandments so designated, as embracing the substance of all the precepts of the decalogue. Following the other rendering, which, I think, must be received, the precepts of the second table are called least, as compared with those of the first table.

conclusive on our present subject,—namely, the reference to the “kingdom of heaven.” “Whosoever shall violate one, even of the least of these commandments, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven,” &c. The “kingdom of heaven” is the phrase employed by Matthew to express the *spiritual reign of Christ*, or the *Gospel dispensation*. This requires no proof. Here, then, not only is respect for the law under the Christian economy inculcated, but we are plainly taught, that under that dispensation it was to be of *binding force as a rule of moral action*; so much so, that he who violated one of its least injunctions, should be of no esteem in the kingdom of heaven; and that, on the contrary, he who strictly observed its injunctions, should be *greatly esteemed* in the kingdom of heaven.

In accordance with this, we find that the decalogue is referred to and quoted in the New Testament, as being authoritative and obligatory as a moral code. One example will suffice. “Children, obey your parents in the Lord. . . Honour thy father and mother, which is the first commandment with promise.”—(Eph. vi. 1, 2.) Could there be a stronger recognition of the permanent moral obligation of the decalogue?

I may, here, in closing, briefly notice a few statements of W. S. respecting the moral law, which are obviously erroneous. He says that this law, “originally written, as it were, by the finger of God on the human heart, is *spontaneously acknowledged*, even by those who transgress it,”—that it is “self-evident” that, in the language of Dr. T. Brown, whom he quotes as expressing his own views, it “requires no commentator to render it distinctly intelligible.” And this “intelligible” and spontaneously acknowledged law is “universal.” Now while I hold that the moral law is unchangeable and eternal, I distinctly deny that it is so obvious as W. S. and Dr. Brown assert. I appeal to facts. Is it a part of the moral law that the creature should worship the Creator, the one living and true God? Surely it is, if anything be a part of it; and yet, polytheism has almost universally prevailed! Nor has the polytheist perceived that he has been transgressing any law; much less condemned himself for such transgression. Is *fornication* a violation of the moral law? yet it has formed a part of the worship of certain heathen gods. Is *infanticide* a violation of the moral law? yet infanticide has been extensively practised without any feeling of its contrariety to any law being entertained. Is *slavery* a violation of the moral law? If so, still slavery is upheld by thousands who do not believe that it is substantially wrong. I might mention a variety of other cases which involve gross violations of the moral law, but which have never been so regarded by the very persons chargeable with them. The moral law, then, is not “self-evident,”—it has not been generally recognised. It does need some one not only to explain it, but to make it known. True, men, even heathen men,

do many things they know to be wrong, for which their conscience checks them. It is also true, that this shows that the requirements (*требья*) of the law are, so far, "written on their hearts." But it by no means follows that they know *all* the requirements of this law. Paul has not asserted that they do; and the contrary is fact.

I need dwell no longer on this point; nor, indeed, need I prolong the present discussion. I think I have made good the positions with which I started, that all the precepts of the decalogue are moral precepts; that the decalogue contains the substance of the moral law; and that it *is*, and is recognised in Scripture as being of permanent obligation.

I have entered on the consideration of this subject not simply from a desire to establish the permanent obligation of the sabbatic *principle*, but also to vindicate the law as a whole, to evince its pure and spiritual character, and exhibit the comprehensiveness of its requirements. How beautifully is this set forth by our Lord in his sermon on the mount! How deep is the import of all the precepts of the decalogue, as is shown by the *commentary* of our Great Teacher! He shows that the feeling of hatred is a violation of the sixth command, and even a lascivious glance a violation of the seventh. We are directed by Him away from the letter to the spirit, from the overt act to the state of the heart, in our interpretation of the law. This very course is indicated by the last precept of the decalogue itself; and, however overlooked and disregarded by the scribes and Pharisees, was, no doubt, perceived by the pious Jews, who worshipped God in the spirit, and not in the letter. With them we are ready to exclaim, Truly "the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. . . The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. Moreover by them is thy servant warned, and in keeping of them there is great reward."

I remain, Mr. Editor,

Yours sincerely,

Waterford, August 31.

I. J.

PARAPHRASE OF THE NINETY-THIRD PSALM.

JEHOVAH reigneth—a wide-sceptering reign,—
 His robes' dread folds hold in them majesty;
 Strength's garment round about him hath long lain,
 Wherewith he wills he should might-girdled be;
 Fast stands the world enchained by his plan—
 Nought yet aside hath swerved it, and nought can.

Thy throne—it had no youth—it hath no age:
 Ere time arose, and on his journey went,
 It was—when he is dead, 'twill be. Their rage
 The floods, O Lord! the floods have high upsent,
 Waves unto waves re-echoing voices vast
 Their wide wild howling 'gainst the heavens have cast.

Oh! high above their crying sitteth He,
 More mighty than the noise of many seas—
 Yea, than the billows shouting mightily.
 Sure are thy promises, O God! yea these
 Are very sure:—within thy temple wall
 All holiness should dwell, and ever shall.

V.

NIGHT.

NATURE's veil is cast around—
 Darkness hides anew the ground:
 But the sov'reign eye of God
 Sees where all his saints have trod.

Jesus, on the mountain side,
 In the night would oft abide:
 There in prayer would show his love
 To his God, and ours above.

Angel spirits in the night,
 Though unseen by human sight,
 Make the saint their constant care,
 While the darkness fills the air.

Rob'd in glory, now he shares
 In believers' praise and prayers:
 And, if we in night apply,
 He is with his presence nigh.

Let the veil then close the hours,—
 I'm preserv'd by heav'nly pow'rs;
 And in prayer I'll pass the night,—
 God will make the darkness light.

L.

REVIEWS.

An Essay on the Profession of Personal Religious Conviction, and upon the Separation of Church and State, considered with reference to the fulfilment of that duty. Translated from the French of Professor A. Vinet, of Geneva. By Charles Theodore Jones. 8vo. pp. 508. London: Jackson and Walford. 1843.

WE are happy to have been the means of introducing this valuable Essay to the notice of the English public. In our December number of last year, our readers may remember that we furnished them with several passages from the original work, which we clothed in an English dress; and that we then took occasion to express our very high opinion of its value and importance. The opinion which we then uttered, has, we are happy to find, been very generally adopted; and we are inclined to hope, that the work of Professor Vinet will take that high stand to which it is entitled. We cannot but regret that the title of the book is not more striking and attractive. The first portion leads to the idea that it is intended for the department of experimental theology, though the latter refers to the controversy with which our age and country are so familiar. The two parts, so dissimilar, suggest to a stranger to the book, that the author would first carry his readers into the quiet retreat of our personal "experience," and anon bring him out into battle field as a zealous opponent of the union of church and state. The truth is, that the whole book is controversial, and from the beginning to the end displays the acumen and tact of a most rigid and unshrinking disputant. The book embodies one grand argument, and leads the reader onward by successive steps, with all the logical sequence of a perfect demonstration. It is a sort of armoury, from which the abettors of the voluntary principle may procure a large supply of weapons for the warfare they are engaged in, and to which a great number will feel themselves indebted for some of the best instruments they can obtain. It is often found easier to write a book than to give it a title; while in some cases the title is the only merit of the volume to which it is prefixed; the case before us, however, is exactly the reverse. After what we have said, it would not be prudent for us to give the book a name, as it is not our business as critics to do more than point out errors or defects which others have to rectify. It will not be difficult, we think, for the author, whose object is "to emancipate religion from the dominion of politics," to give more prominence to his design on the

title-page of his book, and without affecting grandiloquence, or sinking to the quaintness of our forefathers, to furnish in a few striking words a clear promise of the treasures he is prepared to impart.

Professor Vinet's idea of professing convictions may be correctly ascertained from the following passage :—

"We desire to be even more perspicuous when we proceed to require of every individual, of every citizen, to avow his sentiments so explicitly, as that no one shall be able to impute to him, opinions or principles which do not belong to him; and so fearlessly, as to do away with every suspicion of hypocrisy or pretence. There are cases in which silence would of itself expose him to this charge. How much more criminal would he be to allow himself to make professions, or to use language in direct opposition to the real sentiments of his heart! The duty of which we are speaking is so little allied to this or that speculative opinion, that its fulfilment may be demanded in the name of mere worldly honour. It is always the sign of a little mind, to wish to pass, or even to allow itself to pass for what it is not. When a subject is of importance in general estimation, or only in the judgment of those amongst whom we are placed, it becomes us, whatever view we may take of it, spontaneously to declare our opinion, and frankly to avow it. The subject may be one that appears frivolous to us; but it ceases to be so, in consequence of the importance which our fellow-men attach to it.

"Public opinion, when it is sincere, is always worthy of respect. Besides, we must not live or think only for ourselves; we belong to a community whose first interest is mutual confidence, and one of whose first necessities is mutual acquaintance. We are accountable to it, not for all our thoughts, but for those which relate to subjects of general interest and importance. At all events we are bound to let it be known, when we are not interested in those which interest it. Were every thing else unimportant, this at least would not be so. Upon such subjects, dissimulation would be unjust, hypocrisy would be base. To allow ourselves to be guilty of either, would be, to say the very least of it, a miserable exemplification of the obligations of civil society."—pp. 31, 32.

The duty of professing our "convictions" is argued from our direct obligations to truth :—

"And are we not under direct obligations to the truth? What would remain of the image of God within us, or even of the dignity of man, could we lose sight of this great end of our existence? We are, as men, the bounden servants of the truth; but this title would be inappropriate and unjustifiable, should the truth, destined as it is to conquer, be allowed to conquer without our assistance."—p. 33.

No advocate of the open and unflinching assertion of moral and sometimes even of natural truth, will deem it superfluous to argue down the objections which timidity will oppose. We greatly admire the force with which our author describes the claims of truth on the courage of its professors. Take the following passage as a specimen :—

"The performance of duty is not only required of us when we imagine it can be discharged with safety; it must be persisted in and maintained, in the face of dangers distinctly recognised. Consequences should be accounted for nought in the discharge of duty which is of an absolute nature, or, if considered at all, they should be regarded only as motives and additional inducements to its fulfilment. It is in

this spirit only, with this generous intention alone, that it is lawful for us to examine into the probable consequences of its accomplishment. We take indiscriminately the believer and the unbeliever, and we attach to their respective professions of faith and of unbelief two opposite results. Is such profession without its perils? Then who can absolve from it, seeing that it involves no sacrifice, and is a duty? Is it dangerous? Does it expose to the loss of some advantage, to opprobrium, to persecution? Then duty becomes virtue; then duty is felt to be duty; if it be not binding under these circumstances, it never is so. And it is then also that duty bears its fruits, then that it is useful, then that it exemplifies the dignity of human nature and the pre-eminence of the mind over the body, of eternity over time. Such professions, whatever may be their object and their substance, do honour to the immortal and Divine principle within us; they tell against the traditions of materialism; they preserve those of our holy origin; they protest vigorously against the tendencies of those debasing doctrines which would resolve human existence into a handful of dust at the bottom of a coffin, and sum up man's destiny in the grave;—they tend to ennoble the present, and to throw light upon the future.

"We have not said too much; for every thing depends upon this. He who respects and honours not the truth which is within him, is destitute of morals; he who disowns it before men, inwardly despises it. If this fundamental truth be trampled under foot, what will become of the rest? What will become of all our principles, of all our duties, which have no better security? Let us not be misunderstood: wherever dissimulation on the subject of religion has become the rule, although it may not in every instance immediately occasion the entire falling away of the whole moral man, it insensibly produces in the mass of society a vast moral decay, the just retribution for the abandonment of a first principle. Sincerity and candour in the profession of religious belief are pledges of the moral health of the community; so long as profession is honoured, all moral convictions are in safety; but with the dissimulation of religious opinion, come, in rapid succession, doctrinal and practical indifference, a preference given to the expedient over the right, and in the end the complete subversion of morality."—pp. 81—83.

Having very elaborately illustrated and improved the duty of giving publicity to our views of truth, as a duty to truth itself, to our neighbours, and to God, the essayist proceeds to show that this duty is opposed by the very existence of national religious establishments. The principle on which the argument proceeds, and indeed an epitome of the argument itself, is thus given:—

"No one assuredly will pretend to say, that the duty of the individual being to declare his faith, the duty of society can possibly be to prohibit such declaration. To maintain such a position we must infer, that society and the individual were not conceived by the same mind, nor with the same design; that society and the individual are two distinct creations, totally destitute of mutual relations, whom a ridiculous chance has forced to dwell together; and that God, not being the author of one of the two, must of necessity be the author of neither, since his wisdom would certainly have suited society to the individual, and the individual to society. But such a thought would be impious. Let us then set out with the contrary supposition, and let us say, that right cannot be opposed to right, duty to duty, necessity to necessity; and that, if it be the duty of the individual to profess his faith, it must be the duty of society to respect that profession. The one truth implies the other. When we shall have demonstrated that the duty of society is to repress all personal belief, and even to impose its own, we shall not be asked to prove further, that the

duty of the individual is to conceal his religion, or to accept one ready-made from the hands of power; this would have been sufficiently shown. Let it be granted to us then, in the present case, that our first demonstration renders the second superfluous."—pp. 170—1.

In following out these ideas, the writer proceeds to show that the interference of the state in matters of religion, implies the absurd notion that the state possesses a religion, and that consequently the individual in sound logic cannot possess one. In pursuing his course, he grapples with the popular as well as the more recondite arguments directed against the voluntary principle; and how well he answers them, our readers may imagine from the specimen we subjoin, and with which, for want of further space, we must conclude; at the same time commending the volume to the careful study it deserves:—

"Should we be asked: 'What do you desire that religion should become without state support?' we merely reply: Let her become what she can; let her become what she ought to become; let her live, if she have the principle of life within her; let her die, if it must be so: *sit ut est, aut non sit*. She has come into the world, for the purpose of proving that spirit is stronger than matter, strong without matter, strong against matter; we must not hinder her from proving this. If she cannot exist of herself, she is not the truth; if she can live only by artifice, she is herself nothing but an artifice; but if she be of God, it has been given to her, as it was to Jesus Christ, 'to have life in herself.' She must demonstrate this; this is her first mandate, this the indispensable seal of her divinity; and its evidence, like its dignity, has every thing to lose in the minds of men, from a system which always allows it to be a matter of doubt, whether it be indebted to itself for what vitality it possesses, or whether it owes it to the assistance of the public power.

"To this test it must always be ready to submit; if it were not always ready, it would not be of God; but we perfectly understand, that after it has been for a long time incorporated with the state, a trial like this would be resisted, whose conditions would not then appear the same as at the commencement. But if this resistance goes to the extent of believing, that the very existence of religion is menaced by the separation; what an avowal is this! what an idea must be entertained of a religion, which has no root in the human mind, no innate strength, but which must fall, as soon as it is abandoned by the state! Ah! as this is the case, the more resolutely this test may be opposed, the more imperatively shall we insist upon it. It is necessary that it should be known what this religion is; whether it have, or have not, any foundation; it is necessary that it should be known what these believers are; whether they believe in God, or whether they believe in the state; it is necessary that they should know it themselves; it is necessary that without any other predilection than that for the truth, apart from the threats and allurements of power, it is necessary that they should examine themselves, in order to ascertain whether that, which even to this day they call their religion, be a want or a custom, a conviction or a prejudice; it is necessary that they should reconstruct their religion, under these favourable auspices, under these serious impressions. There will be, say they, some defections; this is as they would have it understood; we ourselves think, that those who really believe, will never cease to believe, and that those who do not believe, will have nothing to abjure; and when they tell us, This is all very well for the living, but what will you do with the dead? The dead!—we will tell them to live; they will never find a more favourable opportunity. It is especially for the

interests of the dead, that we call for this test. However this may be, God desires a willing people; let this willingness display itself; if you believe, you ought to desire this; you ought, then, to desire that every thing which takes the place of a willing mind, should disappear, that interest, prejudice, authority, should give way, and that the truth should remain alone."—pp. 301—3.

Rome as it was under Paganism, and as it became under the Popes.
2 vols. 8vo. London: Madden & Co. 1843.

THE title is taking. "Rome,"—what a mystic grandeur there is about that word! What a field does its history furnish for the contemplation of the most imaginative mind, what a problem its rise and fall, for the solution of the profoundest understanding! Surely then, thought we, a book which describes its glory and its gloom, which gives its heathenish and its *christian* story, must be a book of deep and mellow interest. Or, if the object be not merely historical or philosophical, but religious, if its design be to show how much pagan and popish Rome differ, or rather how much they agree, it must teach us solemn lessons, and do good service to the cause of "pure religion" and social progress. What is popery but in great part, a modification and extension of pagan ideas and rites? As Middleton observes in the conclusion of his celebrated "Letter from Rome, showing an exact conformity between Popery and Paganism:"—"The facts already produced, sufficiently prove, that it is *no mistake* to affirm, *that the catholic borrowed from the heathen*; or that *pagan ceremonies* were introduced into the church, while there were *strong prejudices subsisting* in favour of them, which, from these beginnings, have been operating in it ever since with more or less effect, in proportion to the decay of its discipline, and the corruption of its rulers, till they have perfected that form and system of worship, which we now distinguish by the name of *popery*. From this view then of the question, as it is now placed in its true light, it appears impossible, in any sense whatsoever, *that the papists could be originals* in their use of those ceremonies. From the first promulgation of the gospel, as all history informs us, there was a perpetual contest between *the pagan and christian rites*, through a long succession of ages; in which *the pagan rites* were forcibly imposed upon the Christians by the *pagan emperors*; rejected again in their turn by the *christian emperors*; and all of them distinctly marked out and described, at different times, by the *imperial laws*; so as the Christians in all ages might clearly know and avoid them. For example, the laws of Theodosius, as I have already observed, forbade all people, under severe penalties, *to light up candles, burn incense, or hang up garlands to senseless images*. Now these laws, from the time of their publication, have been in the constant possession of the *Romish church*;

perpetually read, commented, and published by their clergy; so that, when the particular rites, therein prohibited, were introduced into the christian worship, in what age soever we should suppose it to have happened, the introducers could not be ignorant of their being *pagan rites*, and consequently could not be *originals* or inventors; but, as I have affirmed in my letter, the *mere borrowers* of them from their *pagan ancestors*.* Entertaining the views expressed in this passage, what was our surprise and disappointment to find the work before us nothing more than an historical defence and commendation of popery, not veiled at all, but real proper *Romanism*! The spirit of the whole is well expressed in the preface:—

"If it be asked who is the hero, or can there be one, seeing that the action extends over the lifetime not of an individual, but of an empire? the story may be said to have a hero in St. Peter. He is as vividly present, speaking still historically, in the last as in the first act; as influential in the resurrection of the empire of the West, in the baptism of modern Europe, when Charlemagne was proclaimed emperor before his shrine, as he is represented to have been when he entered the palace of Lateranus, or raised the son of the patrician from the dead; is as sensibly recognised in the interview of Leo and Attila, in the correspondence of Pope Stephen and King Pepin, as he is supposed to have been when he crossed the Roman Forum with the senator Pudens, or stood on the Tarpeian tower, admiring the imperial city, and disputing with Seneca, Lucan, Petus Thrasea, and the other leading men of the time, concerning its future destinies."

This is a clue to all. Our readers may easily imagine the rest. Of course Peter's residence and preaching at Rome "it is not possible to deny," though the New Testament is silent as the grave about it, though no reference to it occurs in the letter Paul wrote to Rome, mentioning nevertheless, many other and far inferior names, nor in any of the letters Paul wrote from Rome; and history gives a very "uncertain sound." Of course Peter's supremacy over the other apostles is the plainest possible matter, however insufficient the words supposed to affirm it are for that purpose, however inconsistent it is with many occurrences and facts of apostolical history—of course he became bishop of Rome, whatever incompatibility there was between the *universal apostolical* office and the *local episcopal* office, though it would be as improper to call an apostle a bishop, "as it would be to call a king of England a mayor of London." Of course he had unlimited *catholic* dominion, and not only he, but all his successors likewise, "all the bishops of the world being bound to be in communion with the popes of the catacombs," whatever the want of any scripture reference to a *succession*

* We would recommend the "Letter," &c., from which we have made the above extract. It is one of the best *exposures* of popery in existence. If no *cheap reprint* of it has been published, (of which we are not aware,) it is high time there should be one.

of popes, even if Peter were proved to be one, and whatever the resistance to the assumption before it was generally recognised and submitted to. These things are all, of course, indubitable facts, simple matters of plain interpretation and obvious history, though we will be bold to affirm that if such a series of *gratuitous assumptions* as these opinions involve, which are the essential basis of all the claims of Rome, had been made by a few heretics instead of the so-called *catholic*, but really and only *Roman* church, they would have been spurned as men incompetent to form a judgment upon things historical and critical.

The work before us, is for the most part made up of extracts. All kinds of authors are made to contribute something. Authors profane and religious, historical and theological, ancient and modern, poetical and prosaic; all yield something to the statements or proofs or adornments of the book. There is but little of the author's or rather compiler's own. That little shows him to be a man of vivid fancy and considerable powers of description. He has one qualification for such a composition—a most intense faith, *alias* credulity. *He believes like a Roman.* Nothing comes amiss to him in connexion with *the church*. Had the countryman's story of Jonah swallowing the whale been true, it would have been nothing to this man's capacity of credence. It is on a scale worthy of the magnificence of the "eternal city." The only test he seems to know of truth is its direction towards popery; and as full many things have that direction, in full many things he sees the evidence of truth. Popery is with him a veritable Midas, it turns whatsoever it touches into gold, (do not imagine, gentle reader, that word has any carnal slyness in it.) "Whatsoever touches *that altar* is holy."

Perhaps we wrong him. He owns to "some slight imaginative embellishments;" he explains that "the materials of all this have been arranged and cast together under the auspices of imagination!" This makes the reader's task difficult. To separate the chaff from the wheat, the real facts of history from the prolific creations of the author's own fancy, is a very hard and delicate employment. The orthodox faith respecting pagan Rome now is, that its early history is all fabulous, that the witchery and romance of its origin and rise are all moonshine, that the stories that used to delight our boyhood, bringing without a figure often heaven and earth together, though found in histories, are scraps and myths, without certainty and evidence, having passed through many refracting and magnifying media. This is the growing opinion of much that used to be received as plain matters of fact about *Rome the empire*. We are heretical enough to believe that it is very near the truth about *Rome the church*. We would undertake to match any amount of the *secular fables* with *fables ecclesiastical*. There is nothing in the stories of Mars and Rhea Silvia, Romulus and Remus, Faustulus and Acca Laurentia, the wolf and the vultures, which is not fully

represented by the *vicerealty* of Peter, his contests with Simon Magus, the deeds and relics of his infallible and *holy* successors, and all the manifestations and marvels, the revelations and prodigies, "the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders," that go to make up the history, especially the early history of popery. It is therefore, not a very difficult thing to make a tolerable *whole* by adding a few new efforts of imagination to those which are already in existence. But it is for this very reason, very difficult to discriminate between what our author wishes to be received as mere invention of his own, and what as authentic story.

The great idea of the whole work, as indeed of all popery, is an essential error. *Rome christian is the counterpart of Rome pagan.* The church is opposed to the empire. It belongs to the same category. It has the same fortunes, powers, claims. Looking at it alone, no one would suspect or believe, that if it be Christ's kingdom, his kingdom is "not of this world." And further, what pagan Rome was to the world, that has popish Rome been to the church, in *intolerable despotism*. Never did Roman pride of old exult more in the subjection of some new province, than does Roman pride now exult in the overthrow of some christian sect. It rules with a rod of iron. Its one idea is universal subjugation, without a voice or thought of opposition or of doubt. To realise this, it will sacrifice anything, do anything. Rights, civil or religious, never stand in the way long together. Its own honour and faith stand not in the way. Its agents throughout the world are ever prying and planning with consummate skill and subtlety, for its fulfilment. Their words are "smoother than butter," though a little change of circumstances would find them "drawn swords." Proteus himself, would make but a poor Jesuit. With all his changes, he would not be able to change often enough, nor quickly enough. Through many a philosophical thinker, and many an orthodox preacher, and many a liberal politician, and many a charming author, Rome is working—working now. We put our readers on their guard. Let them beware of "the heaven" of popery. The work before us, is only a specimen of the way in which the press is being used, to bring its claims before all kinds of intellects, to impress its charms upon all kind of hearts. Let them not buy books because they have bewitching titles, and gorgeous pictures, and brilliant or touching stories. Especially let them take heed *what books they admit into their nurseries*. In their delight at the substitution of exquisite poetry for wretched doggrels, and beautiful thoughts for intellectual abortions and monstrosities, let them beware, lest *error* should take the place of *nonsense*. We do not give this caution without grounds.

One short extract more we shall furnish, as illustrative of the remarks we made at the commencement of this paper. Our readers will think

over it, we trust. It professes to describe the effect of Peter's statements at Rome :

"But still true to the political and utilitarian bias, so characteristic of the Roman mind, it was the complete solution afforded by Christianity, of the great problem they had been discussing, that chiefly struck the guests of Pudens. If, indeed, this new system were really the work of a divine author, and had for sanctions, not intimations, such as Numa pretended to have received from the fountain nymph Egeria, or as the Augurs, Haruspices, and Quindecemviri discovered in the Sibylline books, in the entrails of cattle, or the evolutions of the winged tribe, but the 'ipse dixit,' and authoritative injunctions of the Supreme Lord and Arbiter of all; then was there found at last, a means of retrieving the tottering fortunes of Rome, and of re-establishing its universal empire upon a truly eternal basis. In the programme of the fisherman, they discerned all that consummate statesmanship that the experience of centuries had suggested to their ancestors;—a solemn worship based upon august and sacrificial rites, calculated to impress the public with awe and veneration for the Divine Majesty;—impressive sanctions, arising from the vivid hopes and fears of future retribution;—expiations for sin;—benisons and sanctifying ceremonies;—a cycle of festivals to body forth, and as it were, dramatise the 'memorabilia' of the new state;—to fill the memory with great examples, and to fire the living to emulation of the illustrious departed. Above all, they were not a little flattered in remarking such a singular coincidence between the hierarchical constitution of the Messiah's empire and their own;—various orders and gradations of ministry under the jurisdiction of one supreme pontiff, endowed with sovereign authority, to bind and loose, to regulate, define, enforce, and ordain anew, tallying in so many instances with what had been devised by the political wisdom of their great ancestors."—pp. 79, 80.

Such is a perfect representation of Popery—such is a perfect misrepresentation of Christianity!

State of Catholicism throughout the World. A Discourse pronounced at Rome at the opening of the Academy of the Catholic Religion, in the year 1843, by the Cardinal Pacca, Dean of the Sacred College, Bishop and Legate of Velletri, &c. Translated and published in The Tablet. Nos. 176, 177, 178. London: G. Dismore.

"His Eminence" Cardinal Bartolommeo Pacca is now in his 87th year, and is, we believe, not only the dean, but the senior member of "the Sacred College" of Cardinals, having been admitted to the conclave more than forty years ago. As an official resident in different countries of Europe, he has been brought into contact with men of all classes and opinions, and has had many opportunities in foreign lands and in his own beloved Italy—in regal courts and public crowds,—of testing the state of opinion respecting the papacy.

His lengthened years and his tenacious memory, enable him to look back upon the palmy days of the church; and it is interesting to listen to his report of "the state of Catholicism" as it was, and now is, in most of the nations of Europe.

He thus describes the past, and the present, respecting Catholic Germany:—

“When I arrived in Germany, in 1786, it might be said that the churches and the clergy of that country were at the top of human greatness. Two archiepiscopal sees were occupied by a brother of the emperor then reigning, and by a son of a King of Poland, Elector of Saxony. At the head of the other archiepiscopal and episcopal churches were placed prelates allied to the most ancient and illustrious families. Vast portions of the soil of Germany, the most fruitful and the fairest, belonged to the clergy, with a right of temporal lordship which stretched over many millions of subjects. Great in the empire were the authority and the influence of the clergy. In the electoral college, over eight electoral members, three were ecclesiastics—the Archbishops of Mayence, of Treves, and of Cologne; the college of princes was presided over by the Archbishop of Salzburg, and all the bishops, as well as a great number of abbés, brought their votes into the diet. All this opulence, and splendour, and power, disappeared before the unjust domination and the rapacious sacrilege of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the clergy of Germany are now reduced to that state of dependence and of mediocrity in which nearly all the remainder of the Catholic clergy are placed.

“But shall we in this recognise an evil to the church? I dare not say so. I consider that the bishops deprived of temporal domain, which might be very useful for the sustainment of the ecclesiastical spiritual authority, when it was applied to that object, and despoiled of a portion of their riches and power, will be more docile to the voice of the sovereign pontiff; and that we shall see none of them treading in the footsteps of the proud and the ambitious patriarchs of Constantinople, nor pretending to an almost schismatical independence. Now also the Catholic population of all these extensive dioceses will be able to contemplate in the pastoral visitations the face of their own bishops, and the sheep shall at least occasionally hear the voice of their own pastor. In the nomination of canons and dignitaries, and of chapters of cathedrals, they shall have more regard, perhaps, to merit than to illustrious birth; it will no longer be necessary to brush the dust from the archives to establish, among other qualities of candidates, six quarterings of nobility; and ecclesiastical titles shall be no more what they had been, surrounded with wealth; no more shall be witnessed what has been more than once beheld—the moment a high dignity or a rich benefice was vacant, nobles who up to that hour had no other post but one in the army, laying aside their uniforms and their military decorations, and all of a sudden invest themselves with the dignity of canons, and ornament with rich and brilliant mitres heads which but a few years before bore helmets. The grave ideas of the sanctuary did not always prevail over those of soldiery. We may then have henceforward less rich, it is true, but better instructed and more edifying pastors.”

Here we have the acknowledgment of a prince of the church, that the depleting which she has suffered by revolutionary changes, has improved her health. The temptations which her enormous wealth supplied to princes and nobles to enter the sacred office have been removed, and adaptation is more regarded in the candidate for the church, than rank.

Although it will be seen from the following extracts, that the Cardinal considers papal affairs in France greatly to have improved, yet the state of that country does not give “the holy see” entire satisfaction:—

"It is true that this kingdom still cherishes many enemies of religion, and that its churches do not assuredly enjoy a perfect tranquillity—but could it be otherwise?"

"When the sea is violently chafed and angered, the agitation of the waves does not cease all of a sudden with the tempest, and it is but slowly and by degrees that the waters subside into their early calm. Religion and the churches behold themselves still attacked at every side by a crowd of enemies; and whilst the partisans of the irreligious doctrines of Voltaire and the philosophers of the eighteenth century endeavour to seduce every class by disseminating at a low price books infected with a blussless deism, we also witness biblical societies engaged in sowing with a profuse hand altered and falsified texts of Scripture, and Protestants arming themselves with a new hardihood. To add to the disorder and the confusion, new enemies have appeared in the camp; these are the fashioners of a new religion, with their extravagant and sacrilegious systems—the Saint Simonians, the Socialists, and the unhappy Chatel, the proclaimer of a new French church. Guilty writers have leagued themselves with these enemies from hell, with their impious and licentious novels; and even dramatic poets themselves have dared to put in play atrocious arts which harden the heart of man, bear the most hateful vices in triumph, and impudently reproduce on the theatre the sacred mysteries and the august ceremonies of the Church. In fine, to this multitude of enemies leagued against them, the clergy witness the adhesion of the University which ought to be its most faithful ally.

"For my part, it appears to me that the Lord, at length appeased, destines that France should be the instrument of his Divine mercies. He wishes that she, herself, should repair the numerous evils which she has caused in the world, in the last century, and at the commencement of the present, by so many impious publications, and by that propagandist philosophy, whose apostles went about in the midst of the people, sowing principles of revolution against all governments, as well as against the Church. And, in fact, it is France that has conceived and executed the magnificent project of an Association for the Propagation of the Faith, destined to second the admirable institution of the Propaganda at Rome; it is France which has replanted on the coast of Africa the triumphant standard of the cross, and given birth to a new African church; it is France, in fine, that under the auspices and direction of St. Sulpice, labours to dissipate the darkness of idolatry among the heathen and savages of Oceanica, and to sustain in Cochin China Tonking the persecuted religion of Jesus Christ, with an admirable apostolical zeal, amid incalculable fatigue, and the glorious blood of those missionary martyrs who have gone forth from her bosom."

There are other passages relating to France, which make it plain that it is the present policy of the Vatican, so to flatter the vanity of "the grand nation" with eulogiums on its past devotedness and its present achievements, as to induce its citizens to extend their characteristic missions at Algeria and Polynesia to other places.

After glancing at the state of church affairs in Russia and Poland—"a state" the Cardinal says, "which can only be described by tears," he thus refers to the Peninsula:—

"Spain and Portugal, at the opposite extremity of Europe, present themselves to our view. These two kingdoms, so remarkable and so celebrated during so many ages for their piety, their sincere devotion, and their filial obedience to the holy see, had the unhappiness, in the middle of the last century, to see ascend the throne, princes estimable for their personal qualities, but of a character desirable to those men who are now-a-days called liberals. They abandoned the reins of their states to ambitious and impious ministers; one of the most terrible chastisements which

God, in his just anger, inflicts on guilty nations, when their crimes, according to the saying of the poet,—

‘Have of his mercy o’erleapt the bounds.’

“In effect, the Count d’Aranda in Spain and Sebastian Carvaglio, better known under the name of the Marquis of Pombal in Portugal, incited, the one by the philosophers of France, where he had been ambassador—the other by the Jansenists, and both by a deep hatred against Rome and the apostolic see, neglected no means of corrupting the public instructors, banishing and sending to a distance from their places and schools, those professors who were attached to wholesome doctrines, to supply their places with men imbued with the errors of Dupin, Trebonius, Peryera, and several others animated by the same spirit. Under the successors of these ministers the same guilty system was continued; and now all their deeds of enmity against the holy see, have produced their deplorable effects. What passes in these kingdoms is but the mournful consequences of this schismatical work.

“When I left Lisbon, my soul was filled with sad thoughts, and with sad forebodings; at the moment the vessel was leaving the shore, I cast a look at the city, *and I shed tears*. But my grief was still greater in Spain. Having gone to the elevated top of Mount Calpé and Gibraltar, from which the eye embraced a considerable portion of the African coast, I compared the deplorable situation of these countries yielded up to infidels and pirates, with the state of the inhabitants who lived there in the first ages of the church, when on their coasts were seen a Tertullian, a Cyprian, an Augustine, and when those famous councils of Africa were celebrated.

“At this moment I do not know how my soul found itself, with this melancholy reflection, that among so many vicissitudes of human affairs here below, and whilst I was then deploring the lot of those unhappy Africans buried in the darkness of an absurd Mahomedanism, perhaps a day of Christianity having arisen for Africa, some European traveller would go and contemplate from the opposite summit of Mount Aliba the coasts of Spain and of Portugal, and would feel in his heart a similar compassion to my own for the infidelity and the apostacy of those two kingdoms heretofore catholic. I wish to behold in this thought nothing more than a poetical fancy, and not a fatal forethought of the future, as I have already said in the account of my voyage from Lisbon to Italy, published some years ago.

“But alas! soon does the deplorable state of religious affairs in Portugal and Spain recal those doleful thoughts to my mind, and I fear that the day has already come in which the faith will abandon these kingdoms formerly so catholic and so faithful. I have seen on the African coast the gallant French nation erect in triumph the standard of the cross, rebuild the altars, convert the profane mosques into temples dedicated to the Lord, and build new churches; whilst on the opposite shore, in Spain, they despoil the altars, overturn or deliver up to the flames the shrines destined for Divine worship. I have seen, again, on the African coast, a holy and venerable pastor, surrounded by zealous priests, not only received with acclamation and cries of joy by catholics, but respected, venerated by infidels, by Arabs, Bedouins themselves; whilst in Spain, opposite them, faithful shepherds of their flocks are cited to lay tribunals, where they are made to undergo iniquitous judgments, by which they are cast into prison, or driven from their sees, and even in the temple of the Lord they cruelly murder the august ministers of the sanctuary at the foot of the holy altar, in hatred of the catholic religion. I have seen, in fine, on the coasts of Africa, at Algiers, received, as angels come down from heaven, the daughters of Saint Vincent of Paul, the venerable sisters of charity, who, having but kindness, goodness, and tender solicitude for the sick, arms so victorious and so winning, exciting the admiration and enthusiasm of infidels, disposing them to

receive the light of the Gospel—to embrace a religion which inspires and produces so many virtues. And on the other shore, in Spain, they banish from their sacred asylums, virgins consecrated to the Lord, and seek by every means to deprive them of the resources necessary for the sustenance of life.

“Does not this seem to announce, as I have already said, and make it be feared, that for Spain the terrible moment is arrived when God in his justice wishes to carry elsewhere the torch of his faith, and to accomplish the fatal threat which the Saviour uttered against the Jews, as cited in St. Matthew: ‘The kingdom of heaven shall be taken away from you, to be given to another people who will produce fruit.’—chap. xxi. 43.

“Nevertheless, these too-legitimate fears are combated by consoling hopes of a better future. A great portion of this gallant nation and of its clergy have preserved in the recesses of their hearts, the faith of their ancestors, and a filial attachment for the holy see, as on the banks of Babylon the captive Israelites cherished in their thoughts and hearts the memory of their beloved Jerusalem. Besides, Spain counts in heaven so many intercessors, that my hopes shall not prove vain. It seems to me that I behold at the foot of the Almighty throne, the tutelary angel of this kingdom surrounded by all the saints which Spain has brought forth, by those founders and reformers of orders, who, after having achieved so much good during their lives in the church by their holiness, continue to work out the same end by the zeal and piety of their numerous posterity, the Dominics, the Ignaciuses, the Joseph Cazalanses, the Johns of God, the Peters of Alcantara, the Therasas. Ah! my heart tells me that the voices, the ardent prayers of so many heroic intercessors will appease the Divine justice, and that the Lord will cast upon Spain and Portugal the eyes of his mercy. But in appointing the day that his clemency may visit this people, may our submission to the decrees of his providence be unshaken.”

The revival of Popery in Belgium, aided as it is by the virtual apostasy of King Leopold from that religion which made the house of his fathers great, is a theme on which this aged orator dwells with marked complacency:—

“Our consolation and our joy increase still more when we consider the state of the church in Belgium. I have seen in the course of my life, four different dynasties reign successively in this industrious and interesting country. The three first, rivals and oftentimes opposed by political and commercial interests, agreed and perfectly resembled each other in one thing—in their application to trample upon and torment this good people, so truly Catholic, by religious innovations. These three first dynasties having been driven off either by foreign arms or by the insurrection and resistance of the people, Divine Providence has at length accorded peace to those good Catholics, and it has executed its design by a wonderful stroke of its omnipotence, by one of those means which the straightened ways of human wisdom might find contrary to the proposed end, means well expressed by this ingenious proverb of the Portuguese language, ‘*Deos escreve dirieto sobre uma regra estorta.*’—God writes on a curved line. In effect, God to procure peace for the Catholics, called the fourth dynasty. He raised upon the throne a new prince, strange by country, born and educated in Protestantism, and attached to the sect of Luther. Who would not have thought but that the enemies of religion would have found a support in him? Well! this prince, worthy to be proposed as a model to those who have had the good fortune to be born in the bosom of the true church, has perfectly learnt the truth and justice of the celebrated words of the great Osius, bishop of Cordova, to the emperor Constance, ‘*Tibi Deus imperium commisit, nobis quæ sunt ecclesie credidit*’—

It is to you, prince, that God has committed the empire; but it is to us that he has confided the interests of his church.

"When the new king of Belgium took possession of the throne, the words he addressed to the clergy expressed the same thought, and he has faithfully kept his promise; for to give to his people a guarantee and complete assurance of the attachment of the new dynasty to the Catholic religion, he desired that his children should be baptized and brought up in our holy and august religion."

Italy is of course eulogised, but it seems that it is still troubled by the doctrines of Jansenism:—

"Nevertheless, we had also the unhappiness of seeing in the seventeenth century, penetrate into Italy, a hypocritical sect from Flanders, and which in order to hide the more securely its intentions and dark projects, disavowed its real existence. Though proscribed and struck with the anathemas of the holy see, it found an easy access, a well-wishing reception in certain cloisters, whose destruction it had already perfidiously meditated, and in the universities, where unnatural children of Italy, unworthy to bear its name, and ungrateful towards heaven and its numerous blessings, embraced the errors of this sect, and dared to defend them. From this double source of public instruction spread and rapidly propagated among politicians, magistrates, and men in the bosom of civil tribunals, those principles of defiance, of jealousy, and of hatred towards the holy see, which, even under the reign of princes, whose private and public conduct was Christian, and whose intentions were pure and religious, reduced the church to the sad bondage of Agar, she who in sacred things should be free and independent queen."

We must yet make another extract, that our readers may know how the present state of religion in England, is spoken of in the high places of Rome:—

"It is with a very different feeling that I consider what passes in another country, in which for many ages religion groaned under a most bitter and a relentless persecution. There they refused to the unfortunate Catholics even the consolation of freely exercising their worship; and not only was not that worship tolerated, but it was proscribed under penalties the most severe and the most cruel. At present, by a wonderful mutation, we see in those same regions new temples and magnificent cathedrals rising up; we see the building of convents and monasteries for the religious of the two sexes—and a well-wishing and generous hospitality is offered to the priests of those foreign nations who have been struck down by the persecutions of their country. It is easy to perceive that I speak of England. These facts are not a little consoling; but there is no reason to flatter ourselves with the idea which some persons do, that the Anglican sect is on the point of expiring. It is very true that it is every day losing ground, abandoned as it already is by numberless sectarians who have fallen into a complete incredulity, and by many others, who, enlightened by Divine grace, are returning to the bosom of their mother, the Catholic church, which has never ceased to feel for them the utmost tenderness. Nevertheless, this Anglican church, all tottering and shaken though it appears to be, is supported by two firm stays—the power of the aristocracy and the opulence of the clergy.

"As long as it shall be permitted to the great ones of this country to distribute to their brothers, to their children, to their nephews, the opulent revenue of episcopal endowments, and the rich benefices which annually raise six million pounds sterling, it is in vain to hope for the disappearance of this sect. But if the Lord continues to

bless the zeal and the labours of our clergy in England, we shall soon witness the abandonment of Protestant pastors by the greater portion of their flocks. It is seldom in Ireland that the Protestant minister of a parish has a larger congregation than his wife and children and clerk. As to the rest, that which the Anglicans call defection, but which we call conversion, will force the government to make serious reflections. In other times it might be feared that it would make the persecution more violent; but in the actual state of Europe we must look for favourable results from it to the cause of the Catholics."

When the Cardinal delivered this passage, he must have forgotten what he had said about Germany. In England, he regards aristocratical alliances and worldly wealth as the strength of the Anglican church; but he confessed that they were the weakness of the Germanic church, and that since it was stripped of its worldly rites and pompous trappings, it has increased in moral power and spiritual efficiency. May not this also be true of the Church of England? so that if "the great ones of this country" should be no longer "permitted to distribute" to their family connexions its enormous wealth, would not that event which he anticipates as the instrument of ruin to Protestantism in England, in fact be the occasion of its glorious renovation?

As to the statement that the numberless sectarians of England "have fallen into a complete incredulity," we can only say that if he means "complete incredulity" as to the authority of the papal see, the truth of apostolical succession, the weight of tradition, &c. &c.; we must admit the fact; but if this "complete incredulity" relates to the Christian faith, the sacred writings, and the triumph of scriptural Protestantism, he is altogether mistaken; and when the day of trial comes in England, by the grace of God these contemned sectarians will show the agents and emissaries of Rome, what their faith is by their works.

THE EDITOR'S TABLE.

A MEMOIR of Greville Ewing, Minister of the Gospel, Glasgow. By his Daughter. 8vo. pp. 672. With a Portrait. London: J. Snow.

The Child's Guide through the Bible: or a Help to understand the Bible as the Record of God's Plans for teaching Men Religion. By Mr. Evans Fletcher, B.A. 12mo. pp. 148. London: Hatchard & Son.

Histoire Critique du Rationalisme en Allemagne depuis son origine jusqu'à nos jours. Par Amand Saintes. Deuxième Edition. Revuë et augmentée. 8vo. pp. 572. Paris: Brockhaus et Avinarius. London: Williams & Norgate.

Exposition of Hebrews xi.; as setting forth the Nature, Discoveries, and Effects of Faith. By an Indian Layman. 12mo. pp. 316. London: Seeley & Co.

An Examination of the Principles and Tendencies of Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Eucharist; in a series of Letters to a Friend. By the Rev. B. Godwin, D.D., Minister of New Road Chapel, Oxford. 8vo. pp. 82. London: Jackson & Walford.

Journals of the Rev. Messrs. Isenberg and Krapf, Missionaries of the Church Missionary Society, detailing their Proceedings in the Kingdom of Shoa, and Journeys in other parts of Abyssinia, in the years 1839, 1840, 1841, and 1842.

To which is prefixed, A Geographical Memoir of Abyssinia and South-eastern Africa, by James M'Queen, Esq., grounded on the Missionaries' Journal and the Expedition of the Pacha of Egypt up the Nile. The whole illustrated by two Maps engraved by Arrowsmith. 8vo. pp. 626. London: Seeley & Co.

Immortality: its real and alleged Evidences; being an Endeavour to ascertain how far the future Existence of the Human Soul is discoverable by Reason. By I. T. Gray, Ph. D. 8vo. pp. 32. London: G. & J. Dyer.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Edited by Wm. Smith, LL.D., Ph. D. Part IV. 8vo. London: Taylor & Walton.

A Pastor's Memorial of Egypt, the Red Sea, the Wildernesses of Sin and Paran, Mount Sinai, Jerusalem, and other principal localities of the Holy Land, visited in 1842; with Brief Notes of a Route through France, Rome, Naples, Constantinople, and up the Danube. By the Rev. George Fisk, LL.D., Prebendary of Lichfield, &c. 8vo. pp. 462. London: Seeley & Co.

The Perils of the Nation. An Appeal to the Legislature, the Clergy, and the Higher and Middle Classes. Second Edition, revised. 8vo. pp. 382. London: Seeley & Co.

The Key to Modern Controversy; or the Baptism Regeneration of the Established Church explained and justified; in reference to the late charge of the Bishop of London. By the Rev. G. Bugg, B.A. 12mo. pp. 72. London: Seeley & Co.

The Trial of the Spirits; or Popery brought to the Scripture Test. The substance of two Sermons preached at Hanover Chapel, Walworth. With Notes, &c. By H. L. Poppewell. 8vo. pp. 40. London: W. Bennett.

Religion in the United States of America; or an Account of the Origin, Progress, Relations to the State, and Present Condition of the Evangelical Churches in the United States; with Notices of the Unevangelical Denominations. By the Rev. Robert Baird. 8vo. pp. 736. Illustrated with Maps. Glasgow: Blackie & Son. London: Duncan and Malcolm.

Selections from the Kur-an, commonly called in England, the Koran; with an interwoven Commentary; translated from the Arabic, methodically arranged, and illustrated by Notes, chiefly from Sale's Edition: to which is prefixed an Introduction taken from Sale's Preliminary Discourse; with corrections and additions. By Edward William Lane. 8vo. pp. 318. London: J. Madden & Co.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

NEARLY ready. The third and concluding volume of "Historical Memorials relating to the Independents or Congregationalists; from their Rise to the Restoration of the Monarchy, A. D. 1660. By Benjamin Hanbury." Published by the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

In the Press. Anecdotes of Peter the Great, Emperor of Russia; intended to exhibit the Result of Perseverance and Laborious Exertion in overcoming Difficulties. By the author of "a Visit to my Birth-Place." 18mo. With a Frontispiece.

Preparations being in progress for publishing a new Memoir of President Jonathan Edwards, the celebrated American Divine, it is earnestly requested that all individuals who have in their possession manuscript letters from him, would forward copies of the same to the Editor of this Periodical. It is also requested that all those who possess manuscript letters from Dr. Jonathan Edwards, junr., Dr. Joseph Bellamy, Dr. Samuel Hopkins, and Dr. Stephen West, of America, would forward copies of the same to the Editor, as it is in contemplation to publish the Biographies of those eminent Divines.

In the Press, and speedily will be published, the Life of Dr. Adam Clarke. By James Everett.

CHRONICLE OF BRITISH MISSIONS.

HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

Statement read by the Rev. Dr. Matheson at the Autumnal Meeting of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, held at Leeds, 12th of October. 1843.

IN presenting a statement to this Assembly respecting the Home Missionary Society of London, it appears only proper to recognise, as a kindred and valuable coadjutor, the *West Riding Home Missionary Society*. You are all well acquainted with the important help which it renders to the cause of evangelical truth in this part of England, by the aid it affords to feeble churches, and by the support it gives to Missionary labours. The large annual sum collected by the churches of this Riding in sustaining its operations, proves the deep interest which they take in the spread of the Gospel around them. Indeed, if it were possible for all the other counties of England and Wales to act in a similar manner, there would be no necessity for a central Home Missionary Society. The existence of any such society, is a proof that there is some deficiency or inability in the churches of other districts of England. This is the case, and it is on this ground that the strong are called upon to help the weak. If the vigorous churches, however, give *all* their strength to their own district or county, what is to become of those places that are destitute? If there are not eight counties in England in which Home Missionary operations are carried on without help, where is that help to come from, but from sister churches able to assist? If that, however, is withheld on the ground that they should confine their efforts to their own county, we can see little hope for the evangelization of our beloved country, as far, at least, as our own denomination is concerned. There are some county associations so feeble that they are unable to sustain one agent. It is chiefly to provide for cases of this kind, that the Home Missionary Society exists. But again, it must be asked, how can it obtain funds to aid such destitute districts, if not from the churches that are able to help themselves and to assist others also? There can be no difference of opinion as to the necessity that exists for enlarged efforts in promoting Home Evangelization; and there can be little diversity of sentiment as to the suitableness of the plans pursued by the Home Missionary Society for accomplishing that object. Happily these have been tried and found successful. The Society was formed in 1819. For several years its income and operations were contracted. Both of these have, however, been much enlarged, especially since it became connected with the Congregational Union. A statement of results can *now* be presented to the churches of our denomination, not unworthy of their reception and their confidence. It is no insignificant agency, to be able to speak of 150 excellent men, who are entirely devoted to the work of the ministry in connexion with your Society, or with pastoral charges. It is no small matter to report, that more than 50,000 persons regularly hear the Gospel from the lips of your agents. It is encouraging to know that the ministry of reconciliation is brought, through their instrumentality, within the reach of hundreds of thousands of the most destitute of England's population, in the agricultural districts of thirty-four counties. It is an interesting fact that in 662 towns, villages, and hamlets, the standard of the cross has been planted; and in calling men to rally round it, the trumpet gives no uncertain sound. Besides this direct and simple method of making known the Gospel, it can be stated, that there are 218 Sunday-schools in connexion with the Society, containing upwards of 13,000 children, who are taught by upwards of 1700 teachers. The agents have also under their special care 110 Bible classes, containing 1400 scholars. Several thousand copies of the Scriptures have been

distributed, while tens of thousands of religious tracts have been regularly circulated. This instrumentality has been accompanied with the Divine blessing, for more than 600 persons have been added during the past year to the Home Missionary churches, the fruit of the labours of the agents of the Society.

The last year was one of severe moral conflict on many of the stations. In a great number of the parishes which your agents regularly visit, there are zealous, bigoted Tractarian clergymen, whose efforts have been effectually checked, by the *simple* teaching of New Testament truths, in connexion with the exertions of the members of the mission churches. Had not your agents been stationed and prepared to act, error would have proved destructive to many. Withdraw these men, and the people are left without advisers or leaders in circumstances of peril. The success of our agents in checking the arrogance of the prelatic teachers, and the defeat of the party in their Factory Bill, (to which your agents contributed, as they sent more than 800 petitions against it,) have greatly exasperated these high churchmen. To have their bigoted pretensions exposed by those despised men, was more than the gentle spirit of Puseyism could endure, and *without any "reserve"* they have poured forth threatenings against the missionaries and their people, more in the manner of *Saul of Tarsus*, than of *Paul* the great apostle of the Gentiles, whose successors they profess to be. Our agents have measured their strength with the false teachers, they have found their instructions feeble, and ascertained that the common people are in little danger from their delusions, when placed within the reach of the Gospel of Christ. What we have to fear is, the progress of error in districts where no counteracting influences exist, and in which the young are trained up in superstitious observances. The death-like stillness of many such parishes, produced by the paralyzing effects of error, is more to be dreaded than the excitement of opposition to our agents. The Home Missionary Society seeks to send active preachers to those defenceless districts, to sound the alarm, to expose delusion, and to direct to Christ. But how is this to be done? The Directors are entreated to do so, by many urgent appeals; they have suitable men training for this special service,—ready to go forth; but their present expenditure is far beyond their income, and their operations must of necessity be reduced, unless the Congregational churches more generally assist. Last year the income was £7800: the expenditure £9300, being £1500 beyond its receipts; and had not a providential supply by means of a legacy been obtained, one-fourth of the agency must have been relinquished this year—a fatal blow to the progress of scriptural, spiritual churches in destitute districts, and a grievous discouragement to all the friends of Home Missions. And what is now to be done to sustain the existing agency? In the present circumstances of our country, to make *no progress* is to retrograde; every thing around us is moving onward. Error is pressing forward with eager steps, evil principles are multiplying victims, and ignorance is producing its baneful effects. Every denomination is active,—and are we of all others, we, who are sometimes apt to boast of our numbers, our intelligence, our zeal, and our moral strength, to lag behind the rest, some of them only recent in their origin, and yet threatening to get far before us in the race of Christian enterprise? Shall we suffer it? Let one sentence tell you what is done in this country for Home Missions by our churches, and then say, if it is proper for a denomination like ours to allow such a state of things to continue when we have it in our power to prevent it. The whole amount raised by all the Congregational associations of this country, including Essex, Lancashire, and the West Riding of Yorkshire, and all that is contributed to the Home Missionary Society of London, is, as far as can be ascertained, under £15,000. To this amount of exertion, must in justice be added the *free labours* of pastors and members of churches, in villages around their several localities. Yet every one must see and feel, that in the present emergencies of our country, and compared with what

our denomination does for *foreign* objects, the amount above stated indicates a great deficiency of effort and of liberality for *Home*.

These things are named not to detract from the deep interest which we all feel for the conversion of the heathen, but to show how the very ability displayed in sustaining that one object might be made available, if called out for Home Missions; a cause which is avowedly and denominationally our own. As this is the first time that the claims of the Home Missionary Society have been brought before its friends in this part of England, the Directors avail themselves of the opportunity to express their hope, that as a branch of British Missions, it will share in the anticipated benevolence of the churches of the West Riding. They venture most respectfully to refer to this subject, because hitherto they have found, that the friends in this quarter, by supplying the wants of *their own county*, concluded they had done their duty to *Home*! That such has been the view entertained is plain from one fact—that the whole sum received from the West Riding churches during the past year has been £9! With this sum the Directors would be perfectly satisfied, if the West Riding friends would undertake all the Home Missionary work of their own county. But perhaps many present are not aware that in the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire the Home Missionary Society has *twelve missionaries*, and gives grants to *six pastors*, and that last year the sum of £450 was spent *beyond* what was received from the churches in those two Ridings! And it should also be stated that not only has this sum of £450 been furnished by the churches in London, but nearly all that has been expended in the other counties beyond what they themselves could raise, has been supplied from the same source! The London churches have thus gone beyond the metropolitan counties, to the northern, as well as to those of the south and west. We presume that this was not before generally known; but we know enough of the enlarged and generous feelings of our friends in the West Riding, to be persuaded that it is only necessary to make out a good case, and that their aid will be given to the extent of their ability.

It is because we have confidence in their judgment, as well as their devotedness, that we claim a share in their sympathy for the Home Missionary Society. To promote the evangelization of Yorkshire, is an object in which we rejoice to co-operate with them. At the same time we believe that when fully made acquainted with our position and circumstances, the same spirit which makes that object dear to their hearts will encourage our efforts for those regions beyond them, which if less populous and less favoured at present than themselves, may yet reward a few years of such seasonable interposition, by becoming in their turn the scene of flourishing churches and willing contributors to the common cause.

IRISH EVANGELICAL SOCIETY.

Paper read by the Rev. Thomas James, at the Autumnal Meeting of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, held at Leeds, 12th of October, 1843.

WHAT can be done for Ireland? is an inquiry that has been instituted alike by the statesman, the political economist, and the Christian. Diversified have been the answers given, and the schemes suggested; whilst her condition to the present moment would seem to indicate that the appropriate remedy for the wide-spreading evils with which she is afflicted, has yet to be discovered. The *physical* features of the country are of a most lovely and interesting kind. God has bestowed on her the richest bounties of his providence, as if intending she should be the very glory of the empire. The beauty of her lakes; the grandeur of her mountains; the fertility of her soil; the number and extent of her harbours; every thing material is

inviting and attractive. The philosopher or the man of taste cannot repair to a richer or more fascinating region.

But to all this the miserable condition of the peasantry; the extended destitution, and deep wretchedness that abound in every direction, stand out in sad and mournful contrast. Even in the midst of the richest and most fertile districts the eye is offended, and the heart is distressed, by scenes of poverty and forms of misery of the most fearful character.

But it is to the *moral and religious* state of Ireland, that, on an occasion like the present, our attention must be chiefly directed. And if the heart be oppressed by the wretchedness and poverty of the peasantry, it must bleed to think of their moral and religious condition. Possessed of a quickness of intellect, and a power of imagination, surpassed by none, and equalled by few, they are still the blinded votaries of the man of sin. They are the bond-slaves of a superstition, the withering influence of which spreads through all the ramifications of Christianity. The crucifix is substituted for the cross; confessions to the priest, for the ministration of the Lamb before God; the service of the mass, for that one sacrifice offered by Christ for the sins of men.

To combat with this gigantic evil, the Irish Evangelical Society was formed nearly thirty years ago. The great design of the institution was to diffuse, by the faithful preaching of the Gospel, the pure unadulterated truth of God. At the period when it commenced its operations, but few, very few men were found in the Protestant Establishment, whose ministrations were calculated to enlighten the mind, or to affect the heart; whilst the Presbyterian church was enfeebled by the extensive prevalence of doctrinal errors. Greatly was the Society blessed in its early efforts, and a large amount of good was effected, which to some extent is now absorbed by the revival of a spirit of piety in the Establishment, and the truly evangelical labours of some of its ministers, and by the increasing purity, and more missionary spirit of the Presbyterian church. The Society has still held on its course, and though it has had, and still has to contend with many and most formidable difficulties, it has nevertheless, to rejoice in pleasing indications of the Divine blessing on its labours. The agents it employs as pastors, missionaries, and Scripture readers, exert themselves amongst a population of not fewer than 200,000 souls; by far the greater proportion of whom are Roman Catholics. The ministers, besides their principal stations, where in many cases, churches have been formed, and congregations gathered, and schools collected, visit the towns and villages within their reach, more or less frequently, according to their respective distances, and preach the glorious gospel of the blessed God. In some places they are greatly encouraged by the numbers attracted by their labours, who are grateful for their visits, and listen with deep attention, whilst they point them to the one sacrifice of Christ for the remission of sins. Every thing in the efforts of the Society convinces the Committee that the great thing to be desired for Ireland, and that which more than anything beside, would raise the population from the miseries with which they are oppressed, is the Gospel, faithfully and affectionately dispensed by holy men who aim at nothing but the salvation of souls. The people will listen with attention even while the errors of popery are exposed, if this be done in a spirit of kindness and affection: and instances sometimes occur in which saving conversion to God is the delightful reward of the faithful servant of Christ.

The recent visit of one of the Secretaries to all the principal stations occupied by the Agents of the Society, and the quarterly reports of the Agents themselves, have brought to the knowledge of the Committee, several districts of labour of the most inviting and promising kind. The Committee, if sustained by the pecuniary contributions of the churches of Britain, are prepared to send forth immediately six

additional missionaries to occupy these fields. They have also instituted inquiries with a view to secure the services of individuals as additional Scripture readers, whose knowledge of the Irish language, and whose efforts in connexion with another Society, render them especially suitable for work of this nature. It is found that when the Irish language can be employed as the medium for conveying religious instruction, the attention of the people is at once secured; and the Committee are therefore exceedingly anxious to extend their operations in this department of their labours.

The Committee also conceive it to be of special importance to direct more of their attention to the larger towns and cities, and to obtain for such places, ministers whose attainments, and the influence of whose character and efforts may, by the blessing of God, secure a concentration of strength, the benefit of which would be felt to a very considerable extent.

Another object has engaged the anxious attention of the Committee; viz. the circulation of useful, and especially religious books, by way of sale at reduced prices. This, it is thought, is a measure of great importance. The entire population of the country is rapidly acquiring the capacity to read, and in some districts of great extent, no books of any kind are to be procured. By some such plan as the colporteur system on the Continent, the Committee have reason to believe large numbers of books may be circulated; and if the people could be induced to *buy* them (and in many districts they are eager to do so,) the influence of the priests will not be sufficient to prevent their *reading* them. This measure is approved by Christians of different denominations in Ireland; and agents are ready to engage in the work so soon as the necessary funds can be obtained, and such arrangements made, as may be found desirable for the advantageous working of the plan.

But whether the Committee will carry these designs into effect or not, must after all depend on the measure of support they receive from the British churches. The churches of our denomination in Ireland, with but four or five exceptions, are too weak to sustain themselves. It is impossible they can assist others. By the benevolence of British churches alone, therefore, can these efforts be supported. The Irish Evangelical Society, to carry into operation all their designs, will need an increase to their funds of at least £500 per annum; and they cannot but think, if the object be fairly contemplated by the friends of evangelical truth, they would at once receive this augmentation of their resources. If the two thousand churches of our denomination in England would contribute but on an average £2 per annum each, all that the Committee *at present* need would be supplied, whilst ground to hope for further and increased assistance would still remain. But instead of being able to enter immediately on these efforts, the Committee are full of anxiety lest they should be unable to meet the demands that are now pressing upon them, and which will arise before the termination of the current year of business. They are already under advances from their Treasurer, whilst they are subject to claims from the Committee of the Irish Congregational Union of Ireland to a considerable amount. They are looking, with strong hope, to the simultaneous collections for British Missions, to be made on the last sabbath in the present month. Could our churches generally be induced to adopt this plan for sustaining the important societies included under that designation, not only would a larger amount of contributions be received, but a deeper interest would be felt for the success of the operations of these important institutions. Ireland is essentially a *missionary* field of labour. As such the Committee regard it, and they are anxious that the churches of this country should have the same judgment. Many circumstances render it, at this crisis, a most promising field of labour. The prevailing, the almost universal sobriety of the peasantry, prepares them to listen with attention, and in some cases, to receive with cordiality the messages of mercy and truth, proclaimed by the faithful preachers of the Gospel.

Even the political agitation, which has awakened so much attention throughout the empire, has excited a spirit of inquiry upon other, and very different subjects. The Committee would gladly meet this feeling with corresponding efforts. They regard it as a favourable sign of the times, and are led to hope, that the things that have happened will turn out rather to the furtherance of the Gospel. The semi-popery of the Oxford school has found its way across the channel, and spread its influence in many directions. But whilst this is to be deplored, it is pleasing to know that in some places it has already led many of the laity of the episcopal church to look about for some other community of Christians, with which they might worship God in a form at the greatest possible distance from the superstitious observances of the church of Rome. To these persons, the simple and spiritual ordinances of worship, as practised by Congregational churches, are found to be especially attractive. The Committee, under all these circumstances, are deeply solicitous to enter these inviting fields, and to labour with greater assiduity than ever, in scattering the seeds of truth, not doubting but that in due time they will be favoured with the appointed weeks of harvest.

The Committee ask then the pecuniary contributions of their friends. With them it remains whether the efforts now contemplated should be made. And they cannot but express the hope, that this their appeal will not be made in vain.

COLONIAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

THE following important document deserves most serious attention and thought. In point of form indeed, it is an address from the Congregational Union of Canada East to that of England and Wales, but the subject of it is mainly "Colonial Missions,"—the state of society in Canada—the value of Congregational principles—the impossibility that they should be maintained and spread in the colonies but by increased vigour and liberality on the part of the British churches—the labours, hardships, difficulties, of Congregational Missionaries in colonial service—all these topics are here discussed, and so represented as cannot fail to impress every thoughtful reader. The appearance of the document in this place is therefore most appropriate, and its statements are recommended to the serious attention of every friend of Colonial Missions.

An Address to the Ministers and Churches composing the Congregational Union of England and Wales, from the Annual Meeting of the Congregational Union for Canada East, held at Montreal, July 6th, 1843.

Beloved Brethren—Having come together from our different and widely distant spheres of labour, to unite our sympathies, and prayers, and efforts, for the advancement of the cause of truth and piety, we should think that a duty had been omitted, and an enlightened and a holy pleasure wilfully lost, were we to separate without expressing our warm affection towards you, and our deep and prayerful interest in the movements that are now trying your courage and patience, and with which the prosperity, not of our denomination simply, but of true and undefiled religion, is so intimately connected.

We have been rejoiced to learn that the apathy which for a time seemed to be well nigh universal, has given place to an energy which is too seldom manifested on behalf of principles which we nevertheless believe to be derived from the revealed will of God; and the diffusion of which would tend to promote the glory of our Redeemer, and the present and everlasting well-being of man.

Painful as those trials are through which you are now passing, it seems that (judging from God's usual method of procedure towards those whom he is about to employ in the accomplishment of some *great work*.) all will prove little enough to

produce throughout our churches, that humility before God, and that combined and sustained energy, which our principles, our professions, our position, and our assigned work, unite to demand. *If it be a "fiery trial,"* we know from the character of *Him* who sits as refiner, that the fire will not be more intense than is absolutely necessary to remove the dross, and to consolidate and purify the gold, and prepare it for the honourable use to which it is appointed.

Most earnestly do we desire for you, that spirit of meekness, and wisdom, and might, which will enable you to oppose successfully all the forms of error, and pride, and worldliness, which may be arrayed against the truth; and humbly and joyfully to endure the reproach which the resisted and subdued enemies of piety will not fail to cast upon you.

You will not need to be told that we also have difficulties and trials, as well as advantages and encouragements, peculiar to ourselves; and we trust, dear brethren, that we shall neither weary you, nor incur the charge of selfishness, if we dwell at some length upon them: for we feel much as some scattered members of a family, far removed from their common home—who when separated and apart, or when occasionally they meet together, can call up a vivid picture of the circle they have left, and enter fully into all their joys and sorrows. But, however tender the sympathy felt by those who remained at home, they are strangers to the scenes amidst which their banished ones are moving; and after all their interchange of thought and feeling, an indistinctness remains upon their minds, which often paralyzes effort on their behalf, or gives it a wrong direction, and which nothing can *fully* remove, but an actual *acquaintance* with the new homes which their friends have found.

Often have we wished that the pastors and members of our churches could take this actual survey of our wide land, and the scattered churches which have been planted by your aid; but this cannot be. We feel it to be a duty we owe to you, as well as to ourselves, to the cause of truth in this province, to make you acquainted, as far as possible, with our actual position—our difficulties and encouragements, our successes and our prospects, that you may be able more understandingly to pray for us, more perfectly to sympathise with us, and more effectually to aid us, in the accomplishment of the great and glorious work in which we are engaged. Especially does this appear a duty at the present time, because we are persuaded that the actual position of most of our churches is not generally known; and because we fear that the churches in our father-land are not yet prepared to enter upon, or to sustain, the work of Colonial Missions, as it is necessary they *should* do, if *justice* is to be done to the great principles for which as a community we are called to contend.

We are not less anxious than our friends at home, that our churches should be *self-sustained*, and that they should gradually, and as speedily as possible, come up to the help of the Society, for more extended enterprise. But in *very, very* few localities can churches be found, and congregations be brought together, able to support their own pastors. *This can* only be the result of long-continued, and in many cases, hard and self-denying labour. Few persons, except those who are eye-witnesses, have *anything like* a correct idea of the difficulties with which the new settler has to contend. Even when a family is in possession of a fertile soil, and in the full enjoyment of health, with prudence and industry, *several years* must pass, before they are able to turn any of the produce of their labour into money, which they can contribute to the support of the pastor whom they love, and for whom, and especially for the truth's sake, they would cheerfully deny themselves. There is scarcely one of us who has not witnessed a self-denial and a liberality which have been rarely seen in the churches at home, and which, if *general* there, would furnish ample means for foreign, and for every branch of British Missions. And are these

feeble churches to be left without pastors, because it must necessarily be several years before they can be self-sustained? Or must we refrain from forming other such churches? Or must we depend altogether on a native ministry for their supply? Suffer us, dear brethren, to say, that *none* of these things can be, without grievous injury to the cause of simple and pure Christianity. A native ministry must not be exclusively depended upon, because the work must not cease until such agents are prepared; and because there are many stations which ought to be occupied by men of experience, and which, if *not thus soon occupied*, will be lost to us altogether.

And, brethren, our hearts are full when it is asked, "are existing churches to be deprived of their pastors, if they do not sustain them without the aid which British churches only can supply?" Indeed this *must not be!* Most of these churches *cannot possibly* do this for years to come, unless very great and unlooked-for changes should take place; and yet, to abandon them would be, in most cases, to give up large tracts of country to cold-hearted formalism, to rabid fanaticism, or to actual heathenism. The question in many instances, (though we wish it to be distinctly understood that there are some very pleasing exceptions,) is *not*, "Shall we give over these few sheep in the wilderness to other shepherds, who shall gather them into another fold, and feed and tend them?" But "shall we give them over to grievous wolves," who will not spare them? Or "to the idle shepherd that leaveth the flock" to perish on the enchanted ground of "apostolic virtue," or "sacramental grace?" We would not "*vaunt ourselves*," neither would we unnecessarily expose the erroneous and dangerous tendency of other influences, which are brought to bear upon the people of almost every section of the country; but this we *must* say, and *ought* to say,—that the Congregational churches, feeble as they are, are in many cases the conservative power which, under God, is to keep the truth pure, and to maintain the scriptural simplicity and purity of the church of Christ in her worship and discipline.

Let us entreat you, dear brethren, to weigh well our position and responsibility. The importance of these and similar churches is *not* to be measured by the number of members they contain; by the amount they can contribute to the support of their pastors; or even by the number of persons to whom the truths of the Gospel are thus brought. It is well observed in the last number of our own periodical (the *Harbinger*), "We are too much in the habit of confining our attention to the *immediate* good resulting from these labours of love, overlooking the cumulative tendency of sanctified influence, and the upward working through the whole mass of the population of that leaven of truth, which the hand of Christian beneficence conveys to the habitations, and instrumentally to the hearts of the poor and needy."

The *principle* here applied to efforts for the good of the lower classes in crowded cities, admits of a forcible application to the scattered churches of our adopted country. We should do wrong were we to estimate their value by a reference to the *direct* and visible and present good they are the means of doing. We must take into the account two considerations to which we are in little danger of giving too much weight; we mean, the sometimes evident and sometimes imperceptible, but still *real* and *powerful* influence they exert upon other denominations, compelling them to be not only more diligent, but often more evangelical; and the influence they must exert upon the *future*, by the education of the rising generation in the principles of pure Christianity, and the character which they gradually stamp upon the community. And it should be seriously considered by the churches in connexion with the Congregational Union of England and Wales, that much of the difficulty attending the formation and maintenance of churches of our order in this land, arises from the work having been so long neglected. Had it been attempted *sooner*, it might probably have been attended with more success, and consequently with less expense.

But we must not ground upon past neglect, an argument for still further delay, or for diminished effort; rather must we endeavour to "redeem the time," by more vigorous and determined exertions, especially when we know, that the longer the work is delayed, the greater will be the disadvantages, the more formidable the obstacles we shall have to surmount.

God has favoured us with a measure of success, which calls alike for humility and thankfulness, for deep abasement and for cheerful hope. He has proved his own faithfulness and readiness to bless us; and often have the songs of joy and praise been heard in the wilderness, while it has been seen to put forth its buds, its blossoms, and its fruit. And we are satisfied that we need but *more labourers*, more prayer, and more faith, to convert the waste into "the garden of the Lord." We "pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth," &c.; but we must *plead with you*, "come over and help us!" Let us have more frequent proofs that *this wide field* is remembered by those who have received the commission, "Go work to-day in my vineyard."

Brethren, "we commend you to God, and to the word of his grace;" and beseech you to bear us and the churches of Canada upon your hearts before the throne of an exalted Redeemer,—and in answer to our united prayers, may the time to favour Zion come, and the church of the living God appear in her glorious apparel, the praise of the whole earth.

On behalf of the Congregational Union of Eastern Canada,

T. ATKINSON, *Chairman*,

RICHARD MILES, *Secretary*.

Montreal, July 6th, 1843.

TRANSACTIONS OF CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

AUTUMNAL MEETING OF THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION AT LEEDS.

THE adjourned Meeting of the Thirteenth Annual Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, was held at Leeds, on the 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th days of October, 1843. Those proceedings not only fully sustained the character of similar occasions in former years for harmony, interest, and importance, but carried it to a still higher point. The results of this meeting have proved that wherever the objects, constitution, and working of the Union, come to be correctly known, many, who before hesitated to sanction it, will be numbered among its firm and warm friends. No less have the proceedings at Leeds shown that two Meetings of the Union in each year are not at all more than are necessary to enable its Assembly to transact the affairs, and to declare a judgment on the questions constantly requiring attention in this period of rapid change, and onward movement. At this point in its history, the feeling of every friend of the Union must be, "to thank God, and take courage."

TUESDAY, October 10th. At twelve o'clock a Meeting to make preliminary arrangements for the order of business, was held in the vestry of East Parade Chapel, the Rev. J. REYNOLDS in the chair.

TUESDAY EVENING. An impressive sermon was preached by the Rev. THOMAS BINNEY, of London, in Belgrave Chapel, the Rev. R. W. Hamilton's, "On the Necessity of Great Private Devotion on the part of Ministers of the Gospel, in order to secure the Divine blessing on their public labours," from Jeremiah x. 21. The introductory prayer in this service was offered by the Rev. J. A. JAMES, of Birmingham. The concluding prayer, by the Rev. Professor VAUGHAN, of the Lancashire Independent College.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, October 11th, the first meeting of delegates and brethren assembled in Belgrave Chapel. The Rev. JOHN REYNOLDS, of Romsey, took the chair at nine o'clock precisely, and opened the proceedings by devotional exercises, presenting to be sung the 87th Psalm, reading a portion of the 17th chapter of the Gospel of John, and offering prayer.

The following ministers and brethren were present, to bear part in the Meetings now reported :—

CHESHIRE.—The Rev. J. Waddington, Stockport.

CUMBERLAND.—The Rev. Henry Wight, Carlisle; Sir Wilfred Lawson, Bart.

DERBYSHIRE.—The Rev. Messrs. Thomas Atkin, Glossop; D. D. Evans, Heanor; James Gawthorn, Derby. Messrs. Jabez Brown, Belper; P. Haslam, ditto; Francis Hurst, Chesterfield; John Sayer, ditto.

DURHAM.—The Rev. Messrs. Samuel Goodall, Durham; R. C. Pritchett, Darlington. Messrs. John Dodds, ditto; T. Stevenson, ditto; Wilson, ditto.

HAMPSHIRE.—The Rev. J. Reynolds, Romsey.

LANCASHIRE.—The Rev. Messrs. W. Bevan, Liverpool; W. Blackburn, Bamford; John Bruce, Liverpool; Richard Fletcher, Manchester; James Gwyther, Manchester; J. Harrison, Heywood; John Kelly, Liverpool; H. Knowles, Warrington; J. W. Massie, Manchester; Robert Massie, Newton; J. L. Poore, Manchester; Wm. Roaf, Wigan; Dr. Vaughan, Manchester. Messrs. Thomas Barnes, Halshaw Moor; Samuel Blackburn, Liverpool; Geo. Hadfield, Manchester; Alfred King, Liverpool; Robertson, ditto; Geo. Summers, ditto; John Thomson, Manchester.

LEICESTERSHIRE.—The Rev. Messrs. Wm. Edwards, Castle Donington; George Legge, A.M., Leicester; James Roberts, Melton Mowbray.

LINCOLNSHIRE.—The Rev. John Paine, Horncastle.

LONDON.—The Rev. Messrs. Thomas Binney; J. J. Freeman; Thomas James; Dr. Matheson; W. S. Palmer; John Robinson; Algernon Wells; Thomas Heath, Missionary, Samoas; Wm. Reid, Stirling, North Britain; H. H. Kellogg, Knox College, Illinois, North America. Messrs. Josiah Conder; Henry Dunn; Thomas Piper; — Spicer.

NORFOLK.—The Rev. G. B. Johnson, Mendham.

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.—The Rev. Messrs. R. Weaver, Mansfield; J. Wild, Nottingham; C. Wilson, Sutton Wakefield. Mr. Alderman Herbert, Nottingham.

SOMERSETSHIRE.—The Rev. J. E. Thoresby, Bristol. Messrs. W. Wills, ditto; Stowe, ditto.

STAFFORDSHIRE.—The Rev. Messrs. Joseph Fletcher, Hanley; John Hill, Gornall; Samuel Jackson, Walsall.

SURREY.—The Rev. R. Ashton, Putney.

SUSSEX.—The Rev. James Edwards, Brighton.

WARWICKSHIRE.—The Rev. Messrs. J. A. James, Birmingham; A. E. Pearce, Lozells; John Sibree, Coventry. J. James, Esq. Mayor of Birmingham.

YORKSHIRE.—The Rev. Messrs. John Allen, South Cave; Wm. Atherton, Bingley; R. L. Armstrong, Worthey; H. Bake, Leeds; S. Barbour, ditto; R. S. Bayley, Sheffield; B. Beddow, Barnsley; Henry Birch, Great Driffield; Joseph Boyd, Burley; J. Bramhall, Stainland; James Bruce, Howden; John Calvert, Morley; Abraham Clarkson, Batley; John Cockin, Holmfirth; Wm. Colefax, Pudsey; J. H. Cooke, Gomersal; J. Croft, Ripon; John Cummins, Leeds; Wm. Eccles, Hopton; J. Elrick, A.M., Northallerton; John Ely, Leeds; Alex. Ewing, A.M., Halifax; John Fogg, Denton; Joseph Fox, Leeds; J. Glyde, Bradford; James Gregory, Kipping; Newman Hall, Hull; R. W. Hamilton, Leeds; J. Harrop, Richmond; J. S. Hastie, Otley; Wm. Hudswell, Leeds; J. Hughes, Dogley-lane; W. A. Hurndall, Huddersfield; T. Hutton, Allerton; H. Jennings, Hull College;

D. Jones, Booth; H. Jones, Sowerby Bridge; Wm. Lamb, Wakefield; W. B. Landells, Sheffield; J. D. Lorraine, Wakefield; R. Martin, Heckmondwike; J. G. Miall, Bradford; J. E. Millson, Pontefract; John Morley, Hull; Ebenezer Morley, Hull; John Morris, Morley; J. W. Muir, Sheffield; Samuel Oddie, Eiland; Wm. Orgar, Hunslet; Charles Payton, York; J. C. Potter, Whithy; James Priddle, Halifax; James Rawson, Leeds; J. Robertson, Knarborough; Thomas Roome, Silcoates; J. A. Savage, Wilsden; Thomas Scales, Leeds; James Scott, Cleckheaton; W. Scott, Bradford; James Sibree, Hull; T. Smith, A.M. Sheffield; R. Stephens, Todmorden; W. H. Stowell, Rotherham; Joseph Stringer, Idle; Thomas Stratten, Hull; E. Tasker, Sheffield; J. Tattersfield, Keighley; J. Wilcock, Potternewton. Messrs. G. Aitchison, Leeds; E. Baines, Jun. Leeds; Booth, Wortley: Wm. Bruce, Leeds; Buchanan, Whithy; T. Burnley, Gomersal; Wm. Campbell, Leeds; John Clapham, ditto; J. P. Clapham, Burley; A. Crisp, Huddersfield; Deniston, Wakefield; Ewing, Leeds; Fletcher, Gomersal; Goodall, Leeds; G. Haigh, ditto; Wm. Hale, Dewsbury; Heaton, Leeds; S. Hodgson, Stainland; Hogg, Leeds; S. Horn, Wakefield; Horner, ditto; P. Lennox, Leeds; Moffatt, ditto; Munro, Silcoates; T. Oates, Sheffield; John Ostler, Hull; J. P. Pritchett, York; H. Rawson, Leeds; A. Richardson, Skipton; George Robinson, Hull; H. C. Scales, Leeds; J. Schofield, ditto; Wm. Schofield, ditto; J. W. Smith, Sheffield; Swift, Leeds; Tapp, Hull; Thompson, ditto; S. Topham, Leeds; John Wade, ditto; James Walker, ditto; John Walker, ditto; J. Watson, ditto; O. Williams, ditto; P. Williams, ditto.

STUDENTS.—Messrs. J. M. Calvert, Airedale; Carver, ditto; P. H. Davidson, Rotherham; Douthwaite, Airedale; J. F. Falding, Rotherham; J. Greener, Airedale; Thomas Hamer, Rotherham; Samuel Horner, ditto; Erastus Hunt, ditto; Hardacre, Airedale; C. Hargreaves, ditto; H. H. Harris, ditto; John Hotham, ditto; Alfred Howson, ditto; Hughes, ditto; William Jackson, Rotherham; Jowett, Airedale; J. Lockwood, London University; John Lewis, Airedale; A. Macmillan, Rotherham; J. C. Macmichael, ditto; Wm. Marten, ditto; J. Muncaster, ditto; Morgan, Airedale; J. Robinson, ditto; Henry Roebuck, Rotherham; W. Shore, ditto; James Smith, ditto; Philip H. Smith, ditto; E. Storrow, ditto; John Wilkinson, Airedale.

The CHAIRMAN, after a few introductory observations, proceeded to say that we must aim at a higher measure of spiritual religion amongst our people if we would receive the tokens of God's blessing. Bent upon that—determined, by the grace of God, to live more to his glory—resolved, under the cherishing influence of his Spirit, to cultivate a higher degree of personal piety;—eager for the attainment of all that it is worthy of Christians to seek, and all that it becomes Christians to accomplish; we shall have the promised blessing of the Divine Spirit, and 'go on our way rejoicing.' I cannot but congratulate you that we are met in this town, where, from peculiar circumstances, the minds of the inhabitants are more especially prepared for some at least of the topics which will be brought before us. And I cannot but express my personal satisfaction and gratitude that this circumstance has afforded me the privilege of once more meeting my esteemed friend and former pupil, Mr. Edward Baines, who has done such distinguished service to the cause of universal and unfettered education, and who has risen with such vigour to the height of that vast argument which has illustrated the truth of our principles, and vindicated all the claims which we have to the confidence of the public and the thanks of our country. Will you now allow me to suggest to you the immense importance of a close adherence to whatever may be brought before you in the course of this day's proceedings. Permit me also to suggest that it is of vast consequence as regards the dispatch of business, that nothing should be brought before the meeting for which provision has not been made in the resolutions, which have been prepared with great anxiety and

care by the Committee in London. The topics which will be brought under discussion are vast and numerous; they require all the wisdom and all the prudence, all the charity and all the energy which you can bring to bear upon such great and momentous matters. You must look to God for the wisdom which is profitable to direct, and bear and forbear with one another. You will, I trust, exhibit that firmness of principle and that courtesy of demeanour, which belong to Christian men and Christian gentlemen met upon the high business on which you are convened. In conclusion, the CHAIRMAN stated, that in order to carry out in some measure the suggestions contained in the sermon by the Rev. T. BINNEY, to which they had listened on the previous night, it was proposed that business should be suspended at 12 o'clock precisely, to enable the assembly to unite in devout exercises of prayer and praise.

GENERAL EDUCATION.

The CHAIRMAN then read the resolutions which had been prepared for discussion on the subject of general education, at the conclusion of which,—

The Rev. J. KELLY, of Liverpool, rose to move that they should be received for discussion. He said—I shall best consult the feelings and the convenience of the present meeting, I think, by confining my observations, and they shall be extremely brief, to one or two points. The time when the present government introduced their measure of national education, was, I presume, in the judgment of all, extremely favourable for such a measure, had it been founded upon just and equitable principles. A great deal had been said in public as to the duty of the government in regard to this question, and a very general feeling was abroad—it was participated in, I believe, very largely by many of us—that something might be done and something ought to be done. Happily, however, the principles on which that measure was founded were in a high degree objectionable. I say *happily*, because it is my conviction,—recently formed I will avow, but still it is *now* my conviction—that any system of national education, on almost any principles which could have been acceded to generally, would have been injurious in its results. I have a strong and deep conviction such would be the case, and all my consideration of the question has only tended to deepen that conviction. The principles, as you all know, on which that measure was based, were of a nature so extremely objectionable as to render it impossible to carry it through Parliament. We are now in this situation. We have put an end to the measure proposed by the government; we have stopped their proceedings; and the question now comes before us practically—What are we prepared to do, in order to secure an object which we have ever deemed desirable, and which is increasingly desirable at the present time? I apprehend the points to which our attention will be directed in the present series of resolutions, will bring up, in one form or other, all that is desirable to be said on this subject,—perhaps a great deal more; one thing is certain, that the general principle pervading these resolutions, that which they are intended to impress upon all our minds, is the responsibility which attaches to us especially, as ministers of the Gospel, with regard to this question—the duty which devolves upon us of taking a leading part in promoting general education. Of course that education may be promoted in two ways, First, through our Sabbath-schools. A great deal has been said as to the inefficiency of these schools, and particular examples of their inefficiency have been adduced. Now, I do not mean to dispute that such cases have occurred; but I am quite sure that they furnish anything but an indication of the real character and general results of these institutions. I think it would be worth any one's while to go into the inquiry, What is the general state of intelligence in which these schools are most commonly found. There can be no possible doubt that in the large manufacturing districts, there is an

amount of intelligence, a capacity for thinking, which has secured a large circulation of exceedingly important works issued from the press in the present day, which never could have got into circulation at all, but for the desire of information and the habit of thinking which these institutions have created. In many of the localities there have been no day-schools; the whole result has been produced by Sabbath-schools; and is I apprehend a sufficient evidence of the general efficiency, on a large scale, of these schools. I will allow that there may have been, in particular instances, what may be called failures, circumstances arising, which have seemed to tell very unfavourably on these institutions; but then it should be remembered that this has arisen, in no small degree, from the fact, that these institutions have aimed less than they might have done, at what may be called the reading powers of the children. We have attended to this only as a subordinate object. Our education has been education in the best sense of the term—the cultivation of the higher, the moral powers of our nature. It was, therefore, to be expected that there would be defects whilst such a system was pursued. But I apprehend it now becomes us to direct our attention to the improvement of these institutions; I do not think that anything which may be said about day-schools ought to induce us to lose sight, for a single moment, of the immense importance of our Sabbath-schools. One of the principal things which claim our attention, is, I imagine, the improvement of the system of Sabbath-school teaching; the improvement of the teachers themselves, in the best sense of the term, so as to make them practically efficient in the discharge of the duties to which they are called. And now with regard to day-schools. I perfectly concur in the principles recognised in the resolutions which have been read on this subject. One of these principles is, that it behoves ministers and churches, where they have the ability, to establish day-schools in connexion with their own church; and that, where they have not this ability, they ought to unite with others, who may be disposed to unite with them, in the establishment of a day-school on liberal principles. Now I must be forgiven if I say that I think where the schools are supported by the congregation, they ought, as much as possible, to be made subservient to the interests of that congregation. We have been so extremely liberal up to the present time, more especially with regard to our education, that we have forgotten principles which we deem to be always of great importance, of increasing importance at the present time. I do not think that any difficulty will be found in the establishment among us of a system of day-school instruction; and we shall thus, I hope, secure a thorough education in reference to our own peculiarities, where the parents are willing that children should be taught them, whilst we open the widest possible door by not insisting on what is peculiar to ourselves, in regard to those children whose parents refuse to let them receive that kind of instruction. Where parents are prepared to submit their children to the whole routine of the school, where they are quite ready to let them receive any instruction which it may be thought necessary to convey to the children, I think we ought to take advantage of such a state of things; on the other hand, if any parents say, "We object to such and such things which you have included in your system of education," I apprehend our wisdom will be to reply, "Well, we do not insist on these things, we should be glad to include them, but still we are prepared to give a thorough substantial education without insisting on these peculiarities." Still I do think that our great characteristic principles ought not to be concealed. The national-school system provides for the inculcation of a great deal which we think extremely objectionable, and its managers and agents insist upon it in practice. I do think, therefore, that under these circumstances we should not hesitate to give to our principles that degree of prominence which they really deserve and demand from us at the present juncture. I have been very unwilling thus to trespass upon the attention of the meeting, con-

sidering the discussion which so important a subject is likely to create, and beg now to propose that these resolutions be received for discussion.

E. BAINES, Esq., Jun. of Leeds, on rising to second the resolution, spoke as follows—Sir, I cannot rise to second the resolution which has been moved by my reverend friend, without, in the first instance, acknowledging the honour which you have done me, by the manner in which you mentioned my name in your opening remarks. I will only ask the indulgence of the meeting for two preliminary observations—first, to express the warm satisfaction I feel in witnessing the assembling, in this town, of the Congregational Union, a union which I think calculated not only to advance the interests of our own denomination, but the general interests of religious philanthropy and freedom; and next to declare my peculiar interest and pleasure in seeing you, Sir, in that chair, to whom thirty years since, I owed the large debt of a part of my own education, and of whom I remember with gratitude that whilst imparting the elements and materials of knowledge, you ever sought to breathe into your pupils your own generous enthusiasm for liberty and truth, for whatever is manly, and noble, and Christian. To come at once to the practical part of my subject, I am persuaded that this meeting is fully alive to the importance of the present crisis in the education of the people. From a variety of causes a mighty interest has been awakened in the subject. It is evident that a great extension of education must and will take place; and whilst we shall rejoice with all our hearts and souls in that prospect, we shall feel that much of the future welfare of the nation, much of the interests of truth and piety, will depend on the course which education may now take. I have felt it to be my duty, Sir, on a recent occasion, when prejudices were excited against these manufacturing districts, which threatened us not only with dishonour before the world, but with danger to our civil and religious liberties, to show that our educational state was by no means so bad as it had been represented; but in doing this, I have never denied that there were yet great deficiencies in the quantity, and still greater defects in the quality of education. I know that there are both; I know, that not only in these districts, but throughout the kingdom, there is yet a lamentable amount of ignorance—there are numbers of the children of the poor wholly uneducated—and far greater numbers receiving an education so brief in duration, and so wretched in quality, as hardly to be worthy of the name. Admitting, then, to the full, this great social want, and admitting, as I am sure every man in this meeting will, that it is the bounden duty of all Christians and patriots to do their utmost to supply it, let us inquire what we, as a religious community, ranking third in numbers and importance among the sects of England, are now doing, and what we can and ought to do, in the good work. It is to be regretted that we have no statistics of education for the whole of England, which are at all to be relied upon. The official returns of 1833, partly from the fault of the schedules sent out, and partly from the incompetency of the parties employed to obtain the returns, give a ridiculously false view of what dissenters have done in promoting general education. But it must be at once admitted that in the department of day-schools, dissenters have been much more defective than in their efforts for the religious instruction of the people, and for the religious education of the young. If I may be permitted to refer, by way of illustration, to the evidence lately collected in the manufacturing districts, I think this meeting will hear with satisfaction, that in a district of Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Cheshire, containing 2,208,000 inhabitants, the number of sittings in Independent chapels was increased from 38,022 in the year 1800, to 124,193 in 1843, being an increase of 86,171 sittings, or 227 per cent; whilst the increase in the population during the same period was only 127 per cent. In the department of Sunday-schools, too, the results are satisfactory, as they show that in the same district the Sunday-schools connected with the Independents contain

57,308 children, taught by 9014 teachers; nearly all the schools being the growth of the present century. The number of sittings provided by the Independents—I need not say by voluntary effort—is just one-third of the number provided by the Established church, and the number of their Sunday-scholars is nearly one-half of the number taught in the church Sunday-schools. But in regard to day-schools the case is very different. The Independents have hitherto done comparatively little in this line; and unfortunately what they have done cannot be distinguished, because their day-schools are not denominational; but they have joined their fellow-christians and friends of education in other sects in supporting the Lancasterian and British and Foreign Schools. But even of these there is a much smaller number than of National Schools,—perhaps not more than one-fourth. The returns to which I have alluded, give no precise information on this head; they were not constructed to show the sects to which the day-schools respectively belonged; but I infer from them that considerably more than one-half of all the public schools in these districts are more or less connected with the Established church: taking the whole of England and Wales, the church schools will have a still greater preponderance. The National Society reported in 1841, 334,899 scholars in its day-schools in England and Wales, and 253,012 Sunday-scholars. The British and Foreign School Society gives no general return for the kingdom; but states the number of scholars in the metropolis and ten miles round at 24,509. The Wesleyans have only recently begun to establish day-schools, and the number of scholars in them is 20,804; but the number is rapidly increasing; and from the committee appointed by the late Conference, to consider this subject, it is highly probable that efforts of a very extended kind will be made to increase their day-schools, which are all connexional, and under the superintendence of their ministers. The Annual Assembly of the Wesleyan Association also passed a resolution to make special efforts for the establishment of day-schools. On the whole, we must admit two important facts, neither of them satisfactory to us as a religious denomination: viz. first, that there is a great deficiency, both in the quantity and quality of general education; and second, that dissenters have not done their share in supplying this great want. The practical questions that are suggested by these facts are, first, How is the admitted want of general education to be supplied? and second, What is *our* peculiar duty in regard to it? On the first point, the answer returned by a host of eminent statesmen and writers, by the example of other countries, and even by popular opinion in our own, amounting altogether to a mass of authority which it is really fearful of confronting, is, that it is *the duty of government* to supply the defect. One of the resolutions before us, avoids the expression of any positive opinion on the propriety of government interference in the education of the people. But I could individually have expressed a decided opinion; and as I am sure it is wished that every speaker should declare his own opinion, in order that a question of such vast moment should be discussed, I will, if the meeting will indulge me, state with all brevity, the result of the best consideration I have been able to give to the subject. I am compelled, then, to declare my opinion, that it is *not* the province of a government to educate the people; and that the admission of the principle that that *is* its province, would lead to practical consequences fatal to civil and religious liberty. The subject is too wide to be discussed at length, but I would respectfully suggest a few considerations in support of the view which I have taken. They are these: first, that the proper province of government is to make and administer laws, to protect person and property, and to conduct the external relations of a country; but that it is *not* its province to train the mind and morals of the people, any more than it is to supply them with food, or to govern their families. Second, that if we grant it to be the province of government to educate the people, we must on the same principle grant that government ought to provide for the religious

instruction of the people,—which admits the whole principle of state establishments of religion; and also to provide for the future supply of their intellectual wants,—which involves a censorship of the press. Third, that if it be the province of government to educate the people, it must be at once its right and its duty to do all that is requisite for that end,—which involves a direct or indirect control over all the machinery of education, over the systems of tuition, over the teachers, over the school books, over the raising and administering of the funds, over the parents and the children, and the employers of labour. It involves both *compulsion and prohibition*, and the enforcing of both by the only instrument which the civil power can wield, namely, fines and penalties. Fourth, that therefore the consistent carrying out of the principle, that it is the province of government to educate the people, would reduce the people of this country to a state of pupillage as complete as that of the people of Prussia, or even of China; it would annihilate freedom of education, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience, and freedom of industry. Fifth, that it would interpose the most serious obstacles in the way of improvements in education, as is shown by the history of the endowed schools. Sixth, that it would put into the hands of government an enormous amount of patronage, which would assuredly be used for party and corrupt purposes, and which would endanger public liberty. There are those who would shrink from the idea of entrusting the education of the whole people to government, who yet think it right for government to provide for the education of the poor. But if the principle be once admitted, that it is the province of the government to educate any portion of the people, I do not see how we could stop short till it had the entire work in its own hands. I would also remind you that one of the arguments most relied upon, in defence of national establishments of religion, is, that they are for the benefit of the poor,—an argument which we feel to be altogether insufficient. There are also those who condemn us for our opposition to the late Factories Bill, saying that education is of such immense value, that it was worth while to make a small sacrifice for the sake of diffusing it more generally. I reply, that nothing can compensate for the sacrifice of liberty, which itself is the best of all educators, because it is the nurse, if not the parent of station,—is great, generous, and good in a community, and the all but omnipotent ally of truth. *We* should have been traitors to civil and religious liberty, if we had allowed a measure so inconsistent with both, to be inscribed on the statute book, and to be a precedent for further usurpations and encroachments. I may be told that the example of other countries, both despotic and republican, is against my theory, and that governments or legislatures have taken the superintendence of education with the greatest advantage in the cases of Prussia, Scotland, and the United States. As the answer is plausible, permit me to say a few words with regard to each of these cases. In the United States, the education given, is, I believe, a purely secular education, and it is superintended by a government which is not identified with any religious sect. In England, on the other hand, the government is identified with one sect, and the clergy of that sect demand that not only a religious but a doctrinal education shall be given in the day-schools. Moreover that sect refuses to co-operate with other sects in the work of general education, except on conditions which would acknowledge and tend to confirm its own ascendancy. In Prussia, the education is said to be religious, but it is directed by a government which also directs the religion of its subjects, and in the greater part of its territories suffers no dissent: here, therefore, the difficulty does not exist which we feel in England; the sword of despotism cuts the Gordian knot. In Scotland, the parochial schools so long established by law, form only about one-fifth of all the schools: the parochial schools are 1,162 in number, whilst the voluntary schools are 4000. Besides, those parochial schools are in the closest connexion with the Establishment; the school-masters must belong to it,

they are subject to examination by the Presbytery, and they subscribe the standards of the church, and at this moment such school-masters and professors are in course of being dismissed because they have attached themselves to the Free Presbyterian church. The public are taxed for the support of these parochial and kirk schools alone, and the schools of the Secession and of the Dissenters receive not a shilling from the tax. The Scotch system, therefore, is not one that is consistent with religious liberty, and not one of which we could approve. On a careful examination of the educational systems of these several countries, I believe we shall find that none of them will afford a precedent for England. Where a government directs the religion of its people, as in Prussia, it may direct a religious education. Where a government never interferes with the religion of its people, as in America, it may direct a secular education. But where, as in England, there is an established religion, and yet a great degree of civil and religious liberty, the government cannot direct what is here required, namely a religious education. If then we arrive at the conclusion that it is *not* the province of government to educate the people, the question presses upon us—Whose province is it? Sir, I conceive that I follow the dictates alike of nature and of religion when I say that first it is the solemn duty of parents to provide for the education of their children, a duty as clear and, when they have the power, as binding, as that of providing for their food and clothing; that in the case of those whose poverty or whose own ignorance precludes them from performing that obligation, it becomes the duty of every Christian and of every patriot to assist in providing the means; that it is the especial duty of all religious communities to take an active and zealous part in promoting the education, and particularly the religious education of the rising race; and lastly, that it is the duty of ministers, by precept and by example, to impress these solemn obligations on parents, Christians, and churches. If I am right in these principles, then we come to the practical conclusion that it is our duty to give our active and liberal assistance in providing for the education of the poor, and that it is our duty as representatives of the churches here unitedly to acknowledge the obligation, and afterwards in our several spheres to act upon it. And now, Sir, I will not be induced by any false liberality to shrink from avowing that I think the present attitude and operations of the Established Church, form a powerful additional reason for our putting forth the most strenuous efforts on behalf of general education. In so far as these operations are pure in aim and motive, we ought to emulate their zeal. In so far as they are tainted with the desire to monopolise the education of the young and to counterwork dissent, we ought to meet them by an activity, in defence of our position and principles, at least equal to that which they show in the attack. Sir, the late Factories Bill, and the present vast subscription raised—I will say, under false pretences—for establishing national schools in the manufacturing districts, are evidences of the same spirit, namely, a determination to reclaim these districts from the mighty evil of dissent. That spirit burns in the clergy and the partizans of the church throughout the whole kingdom, with an intensity that has never been surpassed. What we regard in our consciences, before God, and with his word for our guide, as the more excellent way, the more scriptural and primitive doctrine and practice, the High Church party denounce as heresy and schism. With their act of parliament foundation, and their subjection to secular control,—with their “Popish liturgy, Arminian clergy, and Calvinistic articles,” with their shifting doctrines and irreconcilable differences,—they presume to charge us with sin, because, as disciples of our Lord and his apostles, we scruple to enrol ourselves under the banner of their state church! With these views—honestly entertained by many of them, I doubt not, for superstition and fanaticism may be perfectly sincere—they are resolved to build churches and schools for the entire population; and their hope is thus to undermine dissent, and thus

to empty our chapels and our Sunday-schools. So plainly is this their object, that it would be weakness and folly in us to shut our eyes to it. Then, Sir, if this is the state of things—if the dignitaries of the church, the aristocracy, the ministers of state, and multitudes of wealthy persons throughout the land, are making a mighty effort, by pecuniary sacrifices and personal and official influence, to overbear the dissenting communities—what remains for it but that we use every lawful means to maintain and extend our principles—that we be valiant for the truth—that we meet effort with effort, and sacrifice with sacrifice,—that our ministers feel how much is entrusted to their energy, wisdom, and spiritual prowess,—that the officers of our churches act as men to whom an honourable degree has not been committed in vain,—that superintendents and teachers of Sunday Schools diligently cultivate their faculty of teaching,—that churches seek to grow in the spirit of union, the spirit of liberality, and the spirit of prayer? Sir, I am most anxious that every minister and every church should acknowledge it as a solemn Christian obligation, to give distinct aid to the utmost of their ability, in supporting and establishing day schools, where a sound scriptural education may be given, with every improvement that modern skill and experience can suggest. I am also very anxious that a Committee should be appointed, in connexion with this Union, which should stimulate the churches to the performance of that duty, should ascertain and put on record what is done in this way throughout the Congregational churches, and should annually report the progress that is made; that we may thus either be shamed into greater exertion, or animated and encouraged by the records of success. I only add one further remark; namely, that it seems to me exceedingly desirable that we should give a denominational character to our efforts. Very far indeed, should I be from wishing to cherish sectarian prejudice; and still more, if possible, should I deprecate the exclusion of the children of any denomination, or of none, from the benefit of the schools. But we cannot shut our eyes to the spirit and interest with which men labour first to give to objects identified with their own religious associations, so far beyond what they manifest for general objects. A distinguished Wesleyan minister said to me the other day, “I have no doubt we should get ten times as much from our people for schools connected with Methodism, as we should for general schools.” Believing that he spoke most truly, and that the principle which he recognised, exists in all other sects as well as among the Wesleyans, I cannot doubt that the different sections of the Christian church would much sooner and much better educate the whole of the classes now uneducated if they acted sectionally, than if they attempted to act as one body. They would not only have more spirit and interest in the work, but they would act with closer and more efficient co-operation, with more of that mutual supervision which all men do feel to be so useful, and with a more unrestrained and hearty exertion of the influence of their respective ministers. Brethren and fathers, the cause is before you. It is the cause, first, of those numerous young unfortunates, both in town and country, who may now complain, “No man careth for our souls.” It is the cause of knowledge, order, and piety against ignorance and vice. It is the cause of religious truth and religious freedom against error and intolerance. It is a cause in which to succeed would be glorious; but to fail would be dishonour to us, and disastrous to our country. We cannot but feel that at this crisis, our principles as supporters of voluntary religion are upon their trial. The world is on the watch to see whether they will stand the test. Is there in the voluntary religion of England, not merely a principle of vitality, but of vigour equal to a great exigency? Has it nerve and sinew enough not merely to bear the brunt of a great encounter, but to stand the stress of a protracted contest? Is it cast in that Divine mould, and animated by that heavenly spirit, that it will not be weary in doing good? If now

the Congregationalists of England should sink in the great competition, the effect will be as when "a standard-bearer falleth." If they should triumph, the consequences will be to the glory of God, and the accomplishment of his gracious purposes towards men.

The above address was received throughout with the most marked attention by the meeting.

The motion that the resolutions should be received and considered *seriatim*, was then carried.

The Rev. J. W. MASSIE, of Manchester, said, before the meeting proceeded to dispose of the resolutions, he had a duty to perform in reference to this question. He had a document to present, which emanated from the Manchester district of the Lancashire Congregational Union, and which contained their views on this subject.

The first, second, and third resolutions, which were of a general and declaratory nature, were then agreed to without discussion.

The Rev. R. W. HAMILTON wished to suggest, without the slightest reflection on the past, that brethren would make shorter speeches for the future.

The Rev. J. A. JAMES, of Birmingham, said—I quite concur in the propriety of the hint which our friend Mr. Hamilton has given; but it is to be recollected that the question which is before us at this moment, is of the gravest importance. It is, or should be, considered, literally, *the* question of the autumnal meeting of the Congregational Union at Leeds; and, for one, I could have almost wished that nearly every other subject had been excluded, as far as circumstances would permit, that we might give our whole time to the subject which we are now discussing. Our position is peculiar and striking. We have defeated a great measure. Whether for good, or for harm, it was a gigantic proposal. For harm, of course, we clearly saw that it would be. But it becomes us, as having borne a very conspicuous part in that defeat, to take care that we ourselves are not wanting in supplying what the country unquestionably requires, namely, an efficient system of education. We are bound in honour, by every principle that can influence our minds, to do all in our power to promote the education of the people. We stand pledged, as it strikes me, to supply as a denomination, as far as a denomination can go, that which was intended to be supplied by a much more obnoxious method. Now the subject, as stated by our friend Mr. Kelly, divides itself into two parts. We must not, in our zeal for day-schools, for a moment forget the attention which is due to the improvement of our Sunday-schools. For after all that will be said, and done as the result of what is said, I am afraid that in many parts of the country we shall not find our congregations in sufficient strength to set up day-schools. But every where we are in strength sufficient to maintain influential Sunday-schools. Therefore, I repeat, let us not for a moment, in our zeal for day-schools, lose sight of the importance of our Sunday-schools. Still, even for the defence of our Sunday-schools, day-schools are indispensable where they can be established. If we would retain the children on the Sabbath-day, we must have them under our influence on the week-day. The very existence of the Sunday-school system, therefore, depends upon our putting forth our strength for the establishment of day-schools. [The Rev. gentleman then referred to his own congregation, which, with shame he said it, had hitherto had no day-school in connexion with it; arrangements were then being made, however, to supply the defect.] With respect to the proposal of making our day-school system denominational, I have thought upon the subject, and I do not see how we shall succeed in the effort, which I hope we are about to make, unless we do throw something of a denominational aspect over the system. It is very true, that if we throw off entirely every thing that is of a connexional

character, we may get subscriptions from some few—and I fear that in this day they are but few—liberal churchmen, but these would not be at all in proportion, I think, to the larger subscriptions which we should get from our own congregations if the school stood in connexion with our denomination. There are, in fact, many reasons which present themselves to my mind, why we should act upon this principle. We all know that what is general, and vague, and remote, does not impress the mind so powerfully as that which is well defined, and nearer to us, and in which we have a deeper interest. The church of England, we are told, has advanced twenty-fold in a very few years, not from any love to education itself, but unquestionably arising from the influence of the attachment of its members to the Establishment; the Wesleyans are moving from one end of the kingdom to the other, and moving with considerable effect, as the result will prove, in promoting their system of education. Are we to be the only individuals who shall stand aloof in the glory of indifference, seeming indifference, to our denomination? I believe that the whole work of education will be better done, if done in connexion with our own particular denomination. Now I do not mean that we should introduce into these schools any test, or anything which would exclude a single individual. In this respect, I concur in the remark of Mr. Kelly, that while the children of our own denomination should be instructed in our own peculiar principles, it should be left to the parents belonging to other denominations, if they pleased, to refuse such instruction. I think that something of a scriptural nature, and entirely in scriptural language, might be drawn up to which even churchmen themselves, if at all liberal, would scarcely object, and which at the same time would throw some general principles, connected with vital and fundamental points, into the system of instruction. We shall all go away I trust from this meeting impressed with the necessity of setting up day-schools wherever it is practicable, in connexion with our own congregations; not merely supported by general committees, who will leave it undetermined to whom the school, in fact, belongs. This, I am quite sure, is indispensable to the success of the school. I am known too well I believe as a man of union, to be suspected of wishing to produce a feeling of sectarianism; but, at the same time, we must not fall into that latitudinarianism which would merge all regard for our distinctive and peculiar opinions.

The Rev. JAMES EDWARDS, of Brighton, spoke of the necessity of adopting such a system of instruction as would interest the children, because that was the real way to interest and secure the parents. He believed there were many persons in the Sunday-schools who were well qualified to become masters and mistresses of day-schools; and if they had but zeal and piety enough for the work, a very small expenditure of money would be required to set up schools. They had amongst themselves all the elements which were necessary to carry on this great work. He hoped that the year 1843 would witness such a beginning as would convince their opponents that they were really sincere and in earnest with respect to education.

The Rev. RICHARD FLETCHER, of Manchester, said—One great advantage which would arise from the schools being connected with the congregation, instead of being under the superintendence of a committee, was the guarantee which it would afford for their continuance. The committee might consist of very zealous, active, devoted men, but there was no security unless the school was connected with some particular body. No difficulty of this kind was found to exist with respect to Sunday-schools; they were considered as part and parcel of the congregation, and the honour of the congregation was involved in their support. So, where there was a day-school in connexion with the congregation, the latter would naturally regard it as part of the apparatus, and feel bound to its support. He thought, therefore, that on this ground they had every prospect of success. It struck him, that the great obstacle in many cases would be the expense, and therefore, to many of their congregations,

the impossibility of building schools. To meet this case, he proposed to suggest an addition to the resolutions, to the effect that many congregations might, at small expense, and with little delay, adapt and fit up their existing Sunday-schools, for the purpose of day-schools. The chief difficulty, that of building school-rooms, would thus be provided for. He might also observe, that there were at this time a large number of rooms in most towns standing vacant all the week, which might be hired at a comparatively small sum, and which would, at all events, serve temporarily for school-rooms. For an expense of a few pounds such rooms might be converted into school-rooms. He hoped that the resolution would be made to accord with these suggestions.

The Rev. J. WADDINGTON, of Stockport, spoke at some length of the evil effects of a negative system of instruction: he had himself witnessed them in Stockport. He quite concurred in all that had been said upon that subject.

The business was then suspended for about half an hour, according to previous arrangement, in order to allow time for a Devotional Service. Praise was twice offered by singing, and prayer conducted twice, by the Rev. James Gawthorn, of Derby, and by the Rev. Thomas Stratten, of Hull.

The discussion was then resumed.

Mr. JOSIAH CONDER, of London, said he hoped they were all prepared to maintain the principles of the British and Foreign School Society, with regard to the nature of the education to be imparted. What they wanted, was to connect their schools with, not to limit them to their congregations. Indeed, he believed that "liberal principles" and "Congregational principles" were but two modes of expressing the same idea. They were not, however, so understood by the public. If they announced that their schools were to be conducted on Congregational principles, he believed they would convey to many the idea of their being conducted on sectarian principles. He really believed that they would commend themselves more to members of other denominations by acting denominationally in a catholic spirit, than by acting latitudinarianly in a sectarian spirit. He wished to say one word in reference to the British and Foreign School Society. He knew the anxiety which was felt that the persons sent forth from the normal schools of this society should be, as far as possible, religious persons, and qualified therefore to conduct that admirable feature of the system, the Bible feature, in an efficient manner. If any of the ministers in the country would when they came to London, make a point of witnessing the mode of teaching in the normal schools in the Borough Road, they would return furnished with important information, as well as filled with admiration at the wonderful proficiency to which the children attain under the teaching of Mr. Crossley and others. It is to this society mainly that we must now look to provide us with efficient and religious teachers for our schools. We may send up teachers to them, who may be prepared by them for the work; but at present it is only in connexion with the British and Foreign School Society that we can carry out our object. With respect to the resolutions, he would suggest that they should leave it to the Secretaries afterwards to embody any alterations which were agreed upon by the meeting. He thought this plan would be highly convenient as regarded time.

The Rev. ALGERNON WELLS said, they would endeavour to incorporate the alterations agreed to, to the best of their power. He had himself one alteration to suggest to the meeting. Instead of saying that "in cases where churches are unable, without assistance, to maintain week-day schools, the co-operation of other Nonconformist churches and of liberal members of the Established church should be sought," read, "co-operation with other friends of liberal education should be offered." It would he thought be rather ungracious to say that they would have a school of their

own where they could, and that where they could not they would offer to join others in forming one. There was one observation which he wished to make with respect to the character of their schools. There were numbers of the poor in this country who so appreciated intellectual training, that they would incur losses and hardships to send their children to places where they would learn much, in preference to places where they would learn very little, though the education imparted might be accompanied with the smiles of persons in power, and with certain gifts and advantages, which were withheld from those who did not use the school. It was an important consideration, that they were about to ask the poor to send their children where they would meet with disadvantages of this kind. Society was so built up in this country, that a man's religious opinions might come in almost every where for his secular good or evil; and therefore he thought it behoved them to make their schools as useful and efficient as possible. In allusion to a remark of Mr. James's, he must say, that important as the subject was, he hoped that it would be disposed of before the meeting separated that morning, as there was a great deal of additional business to come before them.

In the course of the discussion, the Rev. J. SIBREE, of Hull; the Rev. Dr. MATHESON; Mr. ATKINS, of Littlemore; the Rev. J. ROBERTS, of Melton Mowbray; the Rev. Mr. COOK, of Gomersal; the Rev. Mr. BAILEY, of Sheffield; and the Rev. R. W. HAMILTON, addressed the assembly.

The Rev. J. A. JAMES said—It was very evident that they could not do without the British and Foreign School Society. They had no means of their own to train masters and mistresses for themselves: even if it were not intended to set up strictly denominational schools, to that institution they must stand indebted for teachers. He trusted, therefore, that the former part of this resolution would receive due and practical attention from the Congregational body. They would not enrich the funds of this Society merely by passing resolutions. He would suggest the propriety of all who derived advantage from it, returning it in some substantial form. They ought all unquestionably, and especially those congregations which could really afford it, to raise an annual subscription for the funds of this Society, in addition to what they raised for themselves. He should propose the adoption of that course himself as soon as the contemplated school, in connexion with his congregation, had been established.

The resolutions as amended in the course of the discussion were then agreed to as follow:—

I. That the subject of General Education, in itself of great and vital moment, has acquired at the present juncture, in the judgment of this Meeting, especial importance, as the result of the successful resistance of the friends of religious liberty to the partial and arbitrary measure proposed by Government in the recent session of Parliament—because the question in this country is now, more than ever, seen to be closely associated with differences of theological opinion on points of vital moment, and with claims on the one hand to ecclesiastical domination, and on the other to religious freedom and social equality.

II. That without pronouncing a decided opinion on the propriety of Government interference in the education of the people, this Meeting entertains the gravest doubts whether any compulsory interference can take place without establishing principles and precedents dangerous to civil and religious liberty, inconsistent with the rights of industry, and superseding the duties of parents and of churches; while all the plans of national education by the agency of Government, suggested of late years, have been very objectionable either to the friends of the Established Church, or to the Dissenting bodies. This Meeting, therefore, concludes, without despondency or regret, that both

the general and the religious education of the people of England must be chiefly provided and conducted by the voluntary efforts of the various denominations of Christians.

III. That as it will behave the Congregational churches to bear an extensive and zealous part in this important work, the present Meeting would respectfully offer the following practical suggestions, as the result of its mature consideration of the subject :—

1. That each church having adequate resources, should support a day-school for boys, and another for girls,—and that in cases where churches are unable, without assistance, to maintain week-day schools, co-operation with other Nonconformist churches, and with liberal members of the Established Church, should be offered,—so that if possible, in every locality where there is a Congregational church, there should be a week-day school on liberal principles. And as it is most important that the proposed daily schools should be commenced with the least possible delay, it is suggested that, in many instances, the rooms at present used for Sunday schools might at once, and with but little outlay, be prepared and opened for the purpose.

2. That the ministers of the Congregational churches are recommended to impress on their people the duty of aiding to the utmost of their power in the education of the children of the poor; and that it is highly important that the ministers themselves should render active personal assistance in the establishment and supervision of schools.

3. That early measures should be adopted to establish a central fund for assisting in the support of school-masters and school-mistresses, in localities where they cannot be sustained without such aid.

4. That the Congregational churches should give to the British and Foreign School Society more effective support than heretofore, as an indispensable central institution to maintain model and normal schools for training teachers,—to promote all improved modes of school management and tuition,—to issue or recommend the best school-books in all departments,—to correspond with the friends of education throughout the country,—and to move and guide the public mind on the great subject of education by public meetings, the press, and other appropriate means.

5. That a Committee of General Education be established in London, in connexion with the Congregational Union, to obtain and publish educational statistics in connexion particularly with our own body,—to communicate with the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society, on behalf of the Independent denomination,—to correspond with churches desiring advice and information relative to the formation or management of week-day schools,—to watch any future proposal or measure of Government on this important subject,—and to seek a friendly understanding, and any practicable co-operation in this great work, with the central committees of other denominations for educational purposes. And that such committee do regularly report its proceedings to the Annual Assemblies of this Union.

It was also agreed that a list of names for the Committee should be prepared on the following morning.

The doxology having been sung, and the benediction pronounced, the assembly adjourned at two o'clock.

DINNER.

Immediately after the adjournment of the morning's meeting, those who were present at its proceedings, together with many of the inhabitants of Leeds, sat down to an excellent dinner provided in the large school-room of East Parade Chapel. Not less than four hundred persons were present. The Rev. T. SCALES, of Leeds, officiated as Chairman.

After the cloth had been drawn, the Chairman expressed the great satisfaction and delight which he felt at seeing the members and friends of the Congregational Union assembled in his own town of Leeds, and then proceeded to welcome them in the name of himself and his brother ministers. After some eulogiums upon the Union and its proceedings, he said, that whatever might be tauntingly said of the disaffection and disloyalty of Protestant dissenters, he could confidently affirm—and confidently refer to history in proof of the statement—that taking them “all in all,” from first to last, there were no subjects of this realm who had maintained a more perfect, a more uniform, and unimpeachable loyalty and attachment to the line of Brunswick, during the period that it had sat upon the throne, than thorough-paced, determined, and consistent Nonconformists. He felt persuaded—and he challenged any one who dared to meet him to the proof,—that their country had no better friends, and their Queen no better subjects, than themselves, the Congregationalists of England, and, he would say too, much as they might be calumniated, the Congregationalists of Wales, who are joined in this Union. The land we live in, said the rev. gentleman, is the object of our love, and she who sits on the throne of these realms, the object of our loyal and fervent attachment; I therefore feel that I am warranted, and have your concurrence, in giving—“The Queen of these realms.” Long may she live to reign in the fear and to the glory of God; long may she live in the attachment and affections, and be sustained by the prayers of her subjects; long may she be spared to promote, by the constitutional influence of her crown, equal laws and equal rights, and to rule over a united, happy, and attached people. This address was received with the greatest enthusiasm.

The Rev. J. ELY then addressed the meeting at some length, reiterating the welcome which had already been given from the chair.

The Rev. R. W. HAMILTON proposed, and the Rev. Dr. VAUGHAN seconded, the following resolution:—

That this Union, while it sympathises with its Anti-pædo-baptist brethren in the recent persecution of those who hold that distinguishing tenet in Denmark and other countries professing the creed of Luther, and in the outrage which was so lately perpetrated on an honoured fellow-countryman and minister,—desires more earnestly to regard this as a strictly common cause;—would avow its deep amazement and abhorrence at such irrational and flagrant proceedings,—and cannot be indifferent to the hope that the all but universal agreement of the Congregational and Anti-pædo-baptist churches, in the principles of Divine truth, and their perfectly equal devotion to the interests of religious liberty, together with every menace directed against their identical cause, will henceforth absorb and extinguish those unhappy and mutually regretted alienations which have arisen between two sections of Christian churches that have scarcely a pretext for considering each other in any wise than *one*.

This resolution having been carried unanimously, the assembly directly afterwards dispersed.

WEDNESDAY EVENING. A large public meeting in support of the Congregational Union was held in Queen Street Chapel, the Rev. Thomas Scales', and was opened with devotional exercises, conducted by the Rev. J. J. FREEMAN, of Walthamstow. The chair was then taken by JAMES JAMES, Esq., mayor of Birmingham, who, after his opening address, called on the Secretary to read a memorial, prepared by the Committee, explanatory of the origin and constitution, the objects and proceedings of the Union, which the Rev. A. WELLS accordingly read as follows:—

Memorial explanatory of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

THE first Christian churches, as Congregationalists believe, were severally complete and independent; not parts of a general organization with a centralized government, but each an organization complete and governed within itself. These distinct and independent churches, however, maintained intercommunity with one another; they recognised each other, assisted each other, counselled each other, communed and corresponded with one another. They knew how to combine individual rights with general interests. Congregationalists think church polity sound, in proportion as it is conformed to the apostolic principles and practices embodied in the first churches. They think the first of the principles just alluded to invariably binding, and always practicable: they hold that every Christian church, without exception, must be complete and governed within itself. This principle they will not violate. They will endure all the inconveniences and disadvantages that may attend a conscientious adherence to it, rather than violate it. The second principle, of the fellowship of churches, they greatly value, but they will not allow it to invade or annul the first principle of their independency. Still, so long as the first principle is maintained inviolate, they think the second can hardly be too fully applied, or too vigorously acted upon; that is, while the churches are really independent, they can hardly be too united. It is, however, obvious that while the first principle does not admit of degrees in its application, the second principle does. A church cannot be more or less complete and governed within itself, for it must be simply and entirely so; but, churches may be more or less united and associated together. The general state of society at different periods, and in different countries, may make great differences in the practicability and desirableness of union among Christian churches. The modes, degrees, and objects for which churches unite, may greatly differ in different ages; but that must be deemed a happy age, when they can unite with great freedom in great numbers, for great objects; spreading wide their sympathies and their energies. The present is doubtless such an age, far beyond any that ever preceded it.

In these known sentiments of Independents, the founders and advocates of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, entirely concur. In attachment to these principles, they yield to none of their brethren. They have, of course, stood forth very prominently in efforts and proceedings to promote the union of the churches, but they have never swerved from attachment to their independency: they have planned and conducted the Congregational Union, not for the invasion or the overthrow of the principles of independency, but for the assertion, the defence, and the spread of those principles.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales originated in a feeling that the Independent churches of this kingdom required a more extended fellowship among themselves, than they possessed before its formation; and that the state of the times demanded of them to come forth, and act as a united body amidst changes, discussions, and events of vast importance to the general interests of the kingdom of Christ. If these views were sound and just, in reference to the state of affairs in this country thirteen years ago, when the first movements were made for the formation of this Union, they are now of much greater force than they were then. It is likely that future years will still more augment their weight and cogency. On every hand, there are indications that religious questions are the questions of the age. Religion daily forces itself on the literature and policy, not of Great Britain only, but of Europe. Every denomination is acting apart in its schools, its missions, its periodicals, its church-extension schemes. Were our own body to seek associates in these activities, they could not be found. Even unsectarian Independents must of necessity, if not of choice, act denominationally. Changes, not to say revolutions, are assuredly coming.

The principles of the Congregational churches were never more important than in the present juncture. If a testimony to them was needed in the day of their depression, it will be even more necessary in the day of their triumph. If they were delivered to faithful witnesses for preservation, in the days when human legislation in the church of Christ was all-triumphant, they must be re-produced pure and incorrupt in those coming days, when human legislation in the church of Christ, baffled and unsuccessful, retires from the scene, and men inquire for the authority to occupy the throne, from which usurpation will have been banished, to return no more.

The objects for which this Union was formed, were two-fold; the one class relating to the interests and welfare of the associated churches; the other class to their influence and action on other bodies of Christians, and on the general concerns of the Redeemer's kingdom. The Union was designed to promote among the churches associated in it, fellowship, counsel, joint care and action in affairs of common concernment to them all. In respect to other bodies of Christians, the Union was intended to enable the Independent churches, as a community, to recognise them, address them, and commune with them. These purposes it has answered well. It has secured thirteen annual assemblies, and four adjourned autumnal meetings, in which the voice of strife and contention has never been heard; and, in which, even differences of opinion have been rare and slight; while much elevating devotion, fraternal love, and important discussion has been enjoyed. With other bodies of Christians in the United Kingdom, on the Continent of Europe, in the United States of America, in the British Colonies, and in missionary stations among the heathen, the Union has obtained edifying communion, both by correspondence and by deputations, received and sent. It has produced a series of tracts, declarations, and other documents in relation to the principles and interests of the denomination, calculated to maintain them within our churches, and to make them correctly known to the public. It has originated the mission to the colonies; and having also secured for the denomination, in a manner at once unobjectionable and effective, the Home Missionary and Irish Evangelical Societies, has consolidated this threefold agency for the religious good of our fellow-subjects, as the British Missions of the Congregational Churches of England and Wales.

The formation of the Union was conducted with every care to ascertain, and pay deference to the general judgment of the denomination, on a subject of so much importance. A Provisional Committee, formed in London, by the desire of many influential brethren in various parts of the country, after mature consideration of the proposal, addressed, in January 1831, a circular letter to the secretary of every association of the churches in England, and to brethren in Wales, stating the design, and requesting that it might be taken into special consideration, and the result communicated to an open meeting summoned to receive those replies, and to proceed in accordance with them in the following May. At that meeting, twenty-two associations concurred by delegation or letter in promoting the design; and the meeting so sanctioned, proceeded to form the draft of a plan for the Union. This, again, was communicated to all the associations through their officers, that it might be maturely considered, in order to the formation of the Union, at a meeting announced for that purpose, in May of the following year, 1832, with all the advantages to be derived from the suggestions of brethren most sound in the principles, and most experienced in the practices of the Congregational churches of this kingdom. At that meeting, held on the 11th of May, 1832, a memorable and a happy day, the Union was formed, with the concurrence of twenty-six associations out of the whole number of thirty-four, then existing in England; four having sent no communication, and four declining the proposal. From that time, while no church or association engaged in forming the Union, has withdrawn from it, every successive year has witnessed the adhesion of

brethren, churches, or associations that for a time hesitated and doubted; till now it may be said, that the Union has very generally the sanction and confidence of the denomination.

No less care was taken to maintain the principles, than to consult the judgment of the churches, in forming this Union. The first article of its constitution is an assertion of the independent rights of churches, and an express disclaimer of authority over them. This union originated no new principle of co-operation among Independent churches, not already embodied in their previously existing associations, and differed from them in nothing but in its extent, and in the circumstance that, being central, it could with more efficiency promote the communion of all the churches, and hold fellowship with other bodies of Christians. Lest the admission of individual churches should ever bring up the question in meetings of the Union, whether an applicant church were really an Independent church, and so involve a judgment upon it—or lest the general Union should ever receive a church not recognised by sister churches in the same district; it was made the only qualification for the admission of single churches, that they should be already recognised by the district association, within the bounds of which they might be located.

The same care to maintain inviolate our distinctive principles that governed the formation of the Union, has presided over all its proceedings. It is not known that any single proceeding of the Union has been charged with violating those principles, either in their letter, or in their spirit. Many apprehensions have been entertained as to the general tendencies of the Union, but, happily, they have not yet been verified by any specific measures or results of this fraternal Union, which surely can have in fact no tendency to violate the very principles on which it is founded, which it distinctly recognises, and for the promotion of which it exists. Indeed, daily experience is proving that there are distinct departments of action for the churches as independent, and as united. Self-government is the object of their independence. Common interests are the object of their union. For the one they act apart,—for the other they act together. In the exercise of their freedom and independence they unite. By their union they defend their freedom and independence. If churches severally free and independent, who have exercised their freedom and independence in forming a union, find that though apart, they love liberty, yet that united, they usurp dominion, they can, and they will, and they ought to, preserve that liberty, by exercising it again in dissolving the pernicious union they had before exercised it to form. Those who were free to enter this union, will find themselves no less free to depart from it whenever wisdom dictates, or danger requires them to withdraw.

Liberty is the first great element of human power—the liberty that consists in security of rights, and freedom of action. Union is the second great principle of power among mankind, in which many combine, and act together with concert, with counsel, and with order. Together, liberty and union in due combination and balance, form the perfectness of social force. Liberty without union enfeebles by scattering and dividing. Union without liberty only employs the force of those already enslaved, for enslaving others; but when men are free, though united; and united, though free, they are strong for good, and only for good. This is the theory of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It would combine liberty and union. It would constitute a free union—a union of churches severally free, and no less free when united. It would make those churches strong in liberty, union, and love; but strong only for truth and charity; a union that could do nothing against the truth, but for the truth; a union whose first act of usurpation would dissolve and terminate its existence.

It is believed that the Congregational churches of England and Wales present an exact adaptation for such a union; and that in these times, they greatly need such a

union. Their constitution is such, that they can cease to be free only when they cease to exist. It is equally impossible that they should part with their own freedom, or invade that of each other. They are of one doctrine—they have common interests—they are warm in mutual affection; therefore they *can* unite. They are called on to defend truth and liberty among themselves, and to spread these blessings through the world; therefore they *ought* to unite. They are assailed, and truth and liberty are assailed, by powerful adversaries, and all their courage and resources are needed for the conflict; therefore they *must* unite.

We much regret that want of space will not allow us to publish the excellent addresses that were delivered by the respective speakers.

Resolutions were then proposed, and unanimously adopted, as follow :—

Moved by the Rev. Professor VAUGHAN, and seconded by EDWARD BAINES, Jun. Esq., of Leeds,

I. That this Meeting, while cherishing with undiminished attachment and decision the distinctive principle of the Independent churches,—namely, the completeness within itself of each several church for its own government, in accordance with the laws of Christ, without the interference of any other parties or persons whatever,—yet perceives that for the many public and general objects in which all the Independent churches have a common interest, it is highly desirable that they should act in union as a body of churches recognising each other, and recognised by other religious communities. And in this view the present Meeting deems the Congregational Union of England and Wales, as explained in the document just read, to be worthy of its confidence and cordial support.

Moved by the Rev. W. J. STOWEL, of Rotherham College, and seconded by the Rev. JOHN REYNOLDS, of Romsey,

II. That this Meeting cannot contemplate the controversies and difficulties in which the Established churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland are involved, and the obvious and growing discordance between such institutions and modern society, so plainly attributable to the unscriptural principle of human legislation in the church of Christ, without feeling an increased attachment to the scriptural views of Christian churches by which Independents are distinguished, and a confirmed hope that those views, in their substance and chief principles, are destined at no remote period to obtain a prevalence in general opinion, similar to that which now secures almost universal assent to the doctrines of Religious Toleration,—a state of the public mind which this Meeting believes will be, whenever realised, eminently favourable to the repose, liberty, and triumph of the church of Christ.

Moved by the Rev. J. KELLY, of Liverpool, seconded by JOSIAH CONDER, Esq., of London,

III. That this Meeting considers the aspect of these remarkable times, whether political or ecclesiastical, theological or social, as addressing a powerful call to Congregationalists for vigorous efforts to disseminate their principles by the press, by missions, by schools, by the erection of chapels,—so that, not for the sake of party but for the sake of truth, they may, at a time when an exhibition of their principles is more than ever important, present a practical and powerful testimony in their favour.

Moved by the Rev. THOMAS SMITH, A.M., of Sheffield, seconded by the Rev. JAMES ROBERTS, of Melton Mowbray,

IV. That this Meeting, while strongly attached to the distinctive principles of the Independent churches, would ever hold them in subordination to the essential truths of the Gospel, and would ground its attachment to them chiefly on their evident

tendency to subserve the interest of those truths;—therefore the Meeting would cherish the warmest love for all those bodies of evangelical believers, with whom they are one in the main articles of the Christian faith, and would delight in all opportunities for promoting harmony, co-operation, and fellowship with them, as branches in the unity of the same Vine.

Moved by the Rev. A. WELLS, of Clapton, seconded by the Rev. THOMAS SCALES, of Leeds,

That the best thanks of the Meeting be given to JAMES JAMES, Esq., for his able and obliging conduct in the chair.

After the reply of the Chairman, the Meeting closed by singing "Praise God from whom," &c., and the benediction pronounced by the Rev. T. SCALES.

We are compelled to postpone the report of the subsequent meetings till our next.

MEETINGS OF COUNTY ASSOCIATIONS.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTH WALES BRANCH OF THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION, was held at Llanbrynmair, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the 26th, 27th, and 28th of September, at which delegates from the various associations attended. The services throughout were peculiarly interesting, and were conducted by the Rev. Messrs. Fairclough, of Festiniog; Davies, of Berea; James, of Rhosymeirch; Edwards, of Ebenezer; Evans, of Barmouth; Jones, of Llanuwchllyn; Hughes, of Llangollen; Williams, of Carnarvon; Thomas, of Rhaiadr; Thomas, of Penarth; Jones, of Dolgellau; Evans, of Llanidloes; Davies, of Trawsfynydd; Parry, of Wem; Morgan, of Llanfyllin; Williams, of Aberhosan; Roberts, of Penybout; Evans, of Penal; Davies, of Aberhafesp; Daniel, of Kerry; Francis, of Newtown; James, of Llansanffraid; Jones, of Penyllys; Lewis and Edwards, of Machynlleth; Davies, of Llanerfil; and Davies, of Llanfair.

At the Conference on Thursday, the Rev. D. Morgan, of Llanfyllin, having been appointed Chairman:

1. The Rev. W. Griffiths' Report of the Proceedings at the last Assembly of the General Union in London was read; and it was thereupon suggested that a remittance should be made from each county to aid its funds.

2. It was resolved that the next anniversary of the North Wales Association shall be held in Anglesea.

3. The Rev. W. Caledfryn Williams of Carnarvon was deputed to represent them at the next Assembly of the Union in London.

4. It was recommended that more general and systematic efforts should be made for the support of our theological institutions; for the establishment of schools, as well as for the increased efficiency of those existing; and for the liquidation of the debts remaining on our places of worship.

5. The steps taken to call a "National Convention" to co-operate with other voluntary societies in promoting the deliverance of the "Church" from state patronage and control, were considered: and it was unanimously recommended that meetings should be held to explain the plans proposed, and that all proceedings which might be adopted for the accomplishment of an object so important, should be conducted in the spirit of Him whose kingdom is not of this world.

6. The Rev. W. C. Williams, of Carnarvon, was requested to address the churches, through the medium of the Dysgedydd, on the high responsibilities of their calling and profession as witnesses for the truth.

AUTUMNAL MEETING OF THE DORSET COUNTY ASSOCIATION.—The Rev. Thomas Ourart preached in the Old Meeting, Wareham, on Tuesday Evening, Oct. 3rd, 1843. A prayer-meeting was held at West Street Meeting at seven o'clock on Wednesday,

October 4th. The Rev. R. Gill, of Charmouth, preached the association sermon in the same place, on "the pure spirituality of Christ's kingdom." Rev. Richard Keynes presided at the Lord's supper. At the business meeting, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"That the sentiment embodied in the last prayer of our Lord Jesus Christ for his disciples, 'That they all may be one—that the love wherewith thou hast loved me, may be in them,' ought to be the governing principle of the church universal, of every individual church, and of every individual Christian; we therefore prayerfully resolve to hail, acknowledge, and love as a brother, every man who bears the image of our common Lord, and as far as it is in our power to cultivate and reciprocate devotional intercourse with all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; and that to such we hereby invite and offer fraternal recognition and cordial co-operation in the great work of converting sinners, of enlarging the true church of Christ, and of evangelizing the world."

The importance of establishing day-schools in connexion with the associated churches, also came under consideration.

In the evening, a devotional service was held at West-street, when short addresses were delivered by the Rev. Messrs. Spink, Chamberlain, and Seavill. A spirit of unity and love happily pervaded all the meetings; the day fine; the attendance good; and the collections £15 2s. 7d.

SURREY MISSION.—The Autumnal Meeting of this Society was held on Tuesday, the 3rd October, 1843, at West-Street Chapel, Dorking, when Mr. E. Bromfield, the Society's Agent at Elstead, was ordained to the work of the Christian ministry. The Rev. James Hill, of Clapham, commenced the service by reading the Scriptures and prayer; the Rev. J. E. Richards, of Wandsworth, proposed the usual questions, and received the confession of faith; the Rev. S. Percy, of Guildford, offered the ordination prayer; the Rev. G. Collison, theological tutor of Hackney College, delivered the charge; the Rev. John Hunt, of Brixton Hill, addressed the congregation, on the necessity of increased effort on behalf of the Society; and the Rev. S. A. Dubourg, of Clapham, closed the service by prayer. In the afternoon, nearly sixty of the friends of the society dined together in the British-School rooms, adjoining the chapel. A public meeting was held in the evening, at which J. T. Graham, Esq. M.D., of Epsom, presided; when addresses were given by the Rev. J. M. Soule, the Rev. James Hill, the Rev. S. A. Dubourg, the Rev. John Burnet, the Rev. Richard Connebee, and the Rev. S. Percy. The whole of the services of the day were of a deeply interesting character; and we trust that this valuable society may receive the increasing support of all the churches in Surrey.

NORTH RIDING ASSOCIATION, YORKSHIRE.—The Autumnal Meetings of this Association were held in the Independent Chapel, Middlesborough, on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 3rd and 4th of October. On Tuesday evening, a preparatory sermon, on the Nature and Extent of the Redeemer's Conquests, was preached by the Rev. John Elrick, A.M., of Northallerton. On Wednesday morning, at seven o'clock, there was a meeting for prayer. The ministers and delegates assembled for the transaction of business at half-past nine, in the vestry of the chapel. The reports from the various churches receiving aid from the association were generally of an encouraging and deeply interesting nature. John Holt, Esq., of Whitby, who for many years has filled the office of treasurer to the association, having on account of advancing age resigned his office, a resolution expressive of gratitude for his past valuable services, was unanimously adopted by the assembled brethren. John Buchanan, Esq., of Whitby, with his accustomed readiness to promote the interests

of religion in the Riding, has kindly accepted the vacant office. On Wednesday evening there was a public meeting, when the claims of the association were ably advocated by the Chairman, J. Buchanan, Esq., the Revs. J. C. Potter, G. Cragg, Wm. Hackett, J. Elrick, J. Shaw, J. Breeze, and J. Jameson.

OPENING OF NEW CHAPELS.

INDEPENDENT CHAPEL, LISCARD, CHESHIRE.—The above chapel was opened for Divine worship on Wednesday, the 19th of July. In connexion with the religious services on the occasion, sermons were preached by the Rev. Samuel Luke, of Chester, and the Rev. Robert Vaughan, D.D., of Lancashire College, in the morning and evening of that day. The Rev. Messrs. Bevan, Pridie, and Appleford, of Liverpool, conducted the devotional parts of public worship. The chapel has been erected and most munificently vested in trust by J. A. Marsden, Esq., for the use of the Congregational dissenters. It is built in the lancet Gothic or Tudor style of architecture, and it is distinguished equally for the simple elegance of its design, and the substantial character of its execution. Two objects of no little interest are the pulpit occupied by the late Dr. Watts, and the marble monument commemorative of that eminent man; both of which the spirited donor has procured and caused to be fixed in their appropriate places in the chapel. May his benevolent wishes in connexion with this truly generous deed be fully realised. On the 1st of August, the Rev. W. Lawson Brown, M.A., late of Lerwick, Shetland, was publicly recognised as pastor of the church and congregation assembling in the above chapel. The service was commenced by the Rev. George Pridie, of Liverpool, with the reading of the Scriptures and prayer. The Rev. William Bevan, of Liverpool, delivered the introductory discourse; and after receiving from Mr. Brown and the church, a declaration of their adherence to the invitation and acceptance, offered up special prayer for both. The Rev. Dr. Raffles delivered a joint charge from 2 Thess. ii. 1; and the Rev. Dr. Crichton, of the Scotch Secession church, Liverpool, concluded with prayer. Besides the above-named ministers, there were present the Rev. Messrs. Lister and Birrell (Baptist), Appleford, Massie, Raleigh, &c. &c.

THE OPENING OF THE NEW MISSION CHAPEL AT NEW AMSTERDAM.—New Amsterdam, the capital of Berbice, South America, was the scene of the labours and death of the late honoured John Wray, of the London Missionary Society. That extraordinary and devoted man commenced his labours there in 1812, and shortly after, formed a Christian church of only eleven members. After having struggled through many difficulties, and encountered violent opposition, in 1824 the small chapel he had erected was destroyed by fire. In the following year a new chapel, fifty feet by thirty, was erected. By that time, the number of church members had increased to upwards of forty; and fifty-four dollars, or about eleven pounds sterling, was collected at the opening. The congregation continuing to increase, and the cause to prosper, in 1832 an additional wing to the chapel, together with galleries, was erected. In 1837, Mr. Wray, after a life of eminent usefulness in a most sickly climate, was called to his reward; leaving behind him, in New Amsterdam, a church of about 200 members, besides five or six other large and flourishing churches in the country districts, of which he had been the founder, the members of which justly regarded the one in town as their mother church. He was succeeded by the Rev. H. S. Seaborn, who arrived there in 1838, but who, on account of a constitution unsuited to so trying a climate, was, after a few months' labour, obliged to return to his native land. The present pastor, Rev. Ebenezer Davies, arrived from England early in 1840, when he found the chapel too small for the comfortable accommodation of the hearers, and altogether unsuited to the advanced state of society consequent on the act of negro emancipation in 1838. Having passed through the crisis

of seasoning, which so often proves fatal to Europeans, and which brought him to the verge of the grave, he began to provide for the erection of a larger and more suitable place of worship. Having matured his plans, and obtained the sanction of the Directors of the Missionary Society in London, he laid them before his people, from whom they met with a most hearty and liberal response. The result is, the erection and the opening, on the 30th of July, and 1st of August last, of the largest and confessedly the best place of worship in British Guiana. It is a noble illustration of the power of the voluntary principle; and the continued and self-denying efforts of the people, to accomplish it in the midst of great discouragement and distress, deserve to be had in everlasting remembrance.

The dimensions of the chapel inside are ninety-four feet by fifty; but out of this, on the ground floor, five feet in front, the whole breadth of the building is taken for a lobby and gallery stairs; at the other end nine feet in the same manner, is partitioned off for vestries; so that the area down-stairs is eighty feet by fifty. The gallery, however, which is circular at both ends, extends over both the vestries and the lobby. In its interior arrangements, the chapel is very much after the model of Dr. Raffles' late chapel at Liverpool, which was burnt down in 1840—a chapel greatly admired by Mr. Davies, and in which he often, in days gone by, sat with delight to hear the Gospel. The Mission chapel will comfortably accommodate about 1200 adults, and 300 children. On the right hand, in the rear of the pulpit, is a beautiful marble tablet, with the following inscription:

Sacred to the memory of

The Rev. JOHN WRAY,

The first Christian missionary to British Guiana,

Whose unostentatious, but firm and constant friendship

For the afflicted and oppressed,

Whose steady promotion of education, and faithful and

Affectionate preaching and teaching of the Gospel of Christ,

Which he exemplified by a holy, active, and blameless life,

During a period of thirty eventful years secured for him

The esteem and confidence of all classes of society

And the grateful love of the people of his peculiar care;

And by the Divine goodness

Rendered him the honoured instrument of enabling many

To look from amidst the toils and sufferings of the

Present state, to the glories and blessedness of immortality.

He was born at South Skirlaugh, near Hull, England, December, 1779,

And died at New Amsterdam, on the 9th June, 1837.

“The minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering

The gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles

Might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.”

Romans xv. 16.

In grateful and affectionate testimony of sincere regard for his

Disinterested benevolence, and veneration of his Christian character,

This tablet is erected by the members of the church and congregation

Assembling in this place, and by his friends in the colony of Berbice.

After a course of preparatory sermons, and a series of special prayer-meetings, the opening services were conducted in the following manner:

On Sabbath, July 30th, in the morning at seven, a prayer-meeting. At half-past ten, the Rev. D. Kerzon, of Albion Chapel, Berbice, read suitable portions of Scripture, and offered the dedication prayer; then the resident minister (in the absence

of the Rev. J. Biggs, Wesleyan, from Demerara, who, on account of an unusually long passage by water, did not arrive in time) preached. In the afternoon, at half-past two, the Rev. D. Kerzon again introduced the service, and the Rev. J. Ketley, pastor of the Congregational church, George Town, Demerara, preached a sermon to the young, to whose accommodation the whole of the gallery was devoted. In the evening, at half-past six, the Rev. A. McKellar, of Brunswick Chapel, Berbice, introduced the service by reading and prayer, and the Rev. J. Ketley preached.

On Monday evening, July 31, a social meeting of ministers, deacons, teachers, and tract distributors was held. From a statement then made, it appeared that one female had, during the last two years, collected about fifty pounds sterling, from friends not connected with the clergy; and other three females about thirty pounds sterling each, towards the chapel.

On Tuesday, the 1st of August, at half-past ten, the Rev. John Dalglish, of Lonsdale, Berbice, introduced the service, and the Rev. J. Biggs preached. In the afternoon, at half-past two, a general communion was held, when the members of other mission churches that were present, sat down with the church in New Amsterdam, to celebrate for the first time, in the new sanctuary, the ordinance of the Lord's supper. It was felt by both ministers and people to be a most interesting and delightful service. The Rev. J. Ketley, the oldest dissenting minister in British Guiana, presided; the Rev. J. Biggs addressed the communicants; and the Rev. J. Roome addressed the spectators who were in the gallery. There were present about 200 members from the country; who, in addition to the 400 members of which the church in town is composed, made the number who sat around the Lord's table on that occasion about 600.

In the evening, at half-past six, a public meeting was held, in which the ministers present delivered short addresses to the careless, to the undecided, to the young convert, to the lukewarm professor, to the backslider, and to the aged Christian.

The opening collection amounted to about £500 sterling, which, together with £3000 they had *specifically* raised for the purpose in little more than two years, makes £3500. But the chapel has cost upwards of £5000, a startling sum truly; but not so large, when the cost of labour and material in that country is considered, and that, in fact, most of the building materials were imported from England, in doing which, they were greatly assisted by two excellent friends of missions in Liverpool—Mr. John Jones, stationer, and John Tomkinson, Esq. The former transacted all the business in that port gratuitously; and the latter gave the beautiful stone steps which adorn the front of the chapel, and also a set of lamps for the chapel. The Directors of the London Missionary Society aided the whole by a very acceptable loan of £600, and by their generous proposal to transfer, if desired, the building and premises into the hands of trustees for the use of the congregation.

NEW CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH AT HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HERTS.—On Tuesday, September 26th, a series of very interesting, and somewhat peculiar services was held at the once Wesleyan, but now Independent, Chapel; the object of which was two-fold—the organization of a number of Christians, formerly Wesleyans, into a Congregational church; and the recognition of Rev. J. Price, once a local preacher, as their pastor. The Rev. T. Hopley, Baptist minister in the town, commenced by the reading of the Scriptures and prayer. The Rev. J. Bull, M.A. Newport Pagnel, then delivered a lucid and argumentative discourse, explanatory of the principles of a Christian church; after which he proposed the following questions to the candidates for Congregationalism:—Whether they agreed to the principles expounded, and fully resolved to act them out? Whether they chose the Rev. J. Price to be their pastor? and if they consented to have two persons (whose names were mentioned) to be deacons? To each of these questions, in order, they publicly and unanimously

signified their assent. The church being now formed, judicious and affectionate counsels were addressed to the deacons and members by the Rev. W. Payne, Chesham, (Baptist) and the Rev. J. Robinson, Luton. The morning engagements were concluded by the administration of the Lord's supper; the Rev. T. G. Stamper, Uxbridge, presided, and Christians of various churches and denominations united in the celebration of this evangelical ordinance. The evening service commenced by the Rev. J. Fernie, Bushey, offering the recognition prayer. The Rev. J. Price, in reply to questions proposed by the Rev. T. G. Stamper, expressed his cordial acceptance of the pastorate, and briefly stated his views of the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel. The Rev. T. G. Stamper then delivered to him a solemn and affectionate charge, founded on 1 Tim. iv. 15; the duties of the church to their pastor were clearly explained and powerfully enforced by the Rev. D. Thomas, Chesham: his discourse was founded on Jer. iii. 15, first clause. The Rev. Messrs. Bartlett, Chenies, Heathcote, Berkhamstead; Wake, Market Street (Baptists) and the Rev. W. Thomas, Saundersfoot, near Tenby, Pembrokeshire, aided in conducting the devotional exercises of the day.

ORDINATION, ETC.

The ordination of the Rev. J. E. Judson, late of Hackney College, to the pastorate of the Congregational church assembling at Lindfield, Sussex, took place on Wednesday, October 4th. The Rev. S. Ransom, Hebrew and classical tutor of Hackney College, preached a luminous introductory discourse; the Rev. E. Jones, of Lewes, asked the usual questions; the Rev. J. Edwards, of Brighton, offered the ordination prayer; the Rev. J. Leifchild, D.D., of London, delivered a very impressive and affectionate charge to the young minister; the Rev. J. N. Goulty, of Brighton, preached an effective sermon to the people. The chapel was crowded with a deeply interested audience, in which were many neighbouring ministers, of whom the Rev. Messrs. Hall, Roberts, Kidgell, Gravett, and Hunter, took part in the services.

We feel great pleasure in informing our readers that the church and congregation assembling in Castle Gate, Nottingham, which in April last were bereft of their pastor by the removal of the Rev. Dr. Alliott to Lambeth, are now happily settled with another minister. The Rev. Samuel McAll, brother of the late Dr. McAll of Manchester, and who has usefully and successfully laboured at Doncaster for the last thirteen years, has accepted their unanimous and cordial invitation, and commenced his ministry on the second sabbath in October under very encouraging circumstances. The high character, standing, and talents of Mr. McAll peculiarly fit him for this very important station. May the great Head of the church bless the union, and render it exceedingly conducive to the promotion of his glory and the prosperity of his cause.

OBITUARY NOTICE OF MRS. HANNAH WILLIAMS,

Of Wem Hall, Shropshire.

BY HER SON, SIR JOHN BICKERTON WILLIAMS.

My honoured mother was born Feb. 15, 1755, at Norbury, in Cheshire. She had two brothers, and three sisters: one sister was older than herself; two were younger. Her parents, John and Mary Bickerton, (before marriage, Mary Swanwick), were pious farmers, and respectably descended. He, indeed, represented the ancient family of the Cheshire Bickertons, some of whose estates, and they were considerable, are said to have been confiscated by Cromwell, because of attachment to King Charles the First.

Mrs. Swanwick, my great-grandmother, before her marriage Miss Tomkin, was a constant hearer of Philip Henry, at Broadoak, to whom, by subsequent marriages there was also relationship.

The earthly career of my beloved mother, though one of evenness and tranquillity, was not unattended with severe trials; but they were sanctified. Her attention to myself, her only child, was both exact and exemplary: her days were devoted to my instruction and happiness. Conscious that the debt of gratitude I owe her memory can never be repaid, I would thus publicly call her "blessed."

A Christian of the old school, she was a pattern of integrity, steadiness, and moderation; and her good sense, prudence, and foresight were consummate. Punctuality, industry, order and economy, also characterised her; and, in proportion to her income, she was charitable, distributing willingly to the cause of God, and habitually considerate of the poor.

She was, moreover, a decided Nonconformist; and, because she believed them to be scriptural, much attached to the principles of Independency. Not only was her regard to public worship instructive, but novelty had few charms; and when it had, the inclination to its indulgence was controlled by principle. She justly regarded *constancy* in her attendance upon the minister of her choice as a paramount duty: and, unlike to many, who seem to have no scruples about disturbing their fellow-worshippers, she was studiously in time. So much did she admire the early Puritans and Nonconformists, that she may be said to have made the writings of some of them, next to the Bible, her companions. This was the case especially with the admirable relics of the Henrys, Flavel, and Dr. Preston.

Her end was peace. Although confined to her bed for several years, she was not merely resigned to the will of God, but contented. She often gave wise counsels to her grandchildren, and showed a lively interest in all passing concerns, with those of the world, and the church.

And—she was cheerful to the last. Two days before she expired, she said to me, as I sat by her bed-side, "Now I will repeat my hymn;" and then went through the whole of Dr. Watts's 142nd Hymn, 2nd book:

"Not all the blood of beasts
On Jewish altars slain," &c.

She next cited the three last verses of the 111th Hymn of the 1st Book: the following very inarticulately:—

"Tis from the mercy of our God
That all our hopes begin;
'Tis by the water and the blood
Our souls are wash'd from sin.

'Tis through the purchase of His death
Who hung upon the tree,
The Spirit is sent down to breathe
On such dry bones as we."

But, as if suddenly invigorated, she added, with considerable energy,—

"Rais'd from the dead, we live anew;
And, justified by grace,
We shall appear in glory too,
And see our Father's face."

This was her latest effort, and it exhausted, for a season, her decaying strength.

Consciousness and collectedness were, however, mercifully continued to the end; and on Sunday, 25th April, 1841, about twenty minutes past nine A.M. literally fell asleep, aged eighty-eight years, two months, and ten days.

The following Friday her remains were removed to Shrewsbury, and laid up until the morning of the resurrection, in the burying-ground attached to Swan-Hill Chapel.

Her excellent minister, now mine, the Rev. Joseph Pattison, improved the event in a sermon founded upon Job v. 26: "Thou shalt come to thy grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in his season." Her grandson, Philip Henry Williams, M.D., who resides at Worcester, thus poetically embalmed her memory. He saw her die.

Farewell, thou aged saint! Thy shatter'd frame
Had long been tarrying on the extremest verge
Of the great precipice that overhangs
The deep and silent waters of the tomb.

Yet now the clod that held thy lingering feet
Upon the brink, has gently given way,
And let thee down into the chilly stream.

How easy thy descent! No struggle broke
The stillness of the scene. There was no *phunge*
To tell that thou wert gone;—but those who *watch'd*
Could trace thy peaceful *lighting* on the breast
Of the dark sea, whose parting waves appear'd
To strive how softly they could let thee in.

Thy soul had no alarm,—for she had long
Been waiting for the brittle shreds to snap,
And set her pinions free;—she only stay'd
Upon the brink, until her crumbling house
Had reach'd its resting place;—and then uprose,
Amid the greetings of angelic guards,
To take possession of a heavenly crown.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Favours have been received from the Revs. Dr. Alliott, Urwick, Burder, W. Smith. Rev. Messrs. George Taylor, R. Connebee, S. Roberts, John Robinson, Robert Chamberlain, D. Thomas, W. Robinson, Henry Bromley, J. E. Judson, Charles Bingley, Thomas Mays, J. H. Godwin, J. P. Mursell, W. Campbell.

Sir J. B. Williams, J. R. Mills, Esq., N. Rogers.

V., Aliquis, Scrutator.

N. W. M., Z. Z.

The paper of Z. Z. will be sent to the Committee of the Congregational Union, as the Editor declines to enter upon the discussion of the subject to which it relates.